

New England States and other citizens of New England, and librarian of the free public library of New Haven, Conn., for forest reserves in the Appalachian and White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the librarian of Wesleyan University library, Middletown, Conn., against section 30 of the bill H. R. 19853, relative to importation of English books—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the St. Paul Retail Grocers' Association, for repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of the librarian of the city of Manchester, against abridgment of the rights of libraries to import English books—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Pender Council, No. 59, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Towle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Deiterle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Uhlertown Council, No. 522, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 10, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

THOMAS M. PATTERSON, a Senator from the State of Colorado, and WILLIAM J. STONE, a Senator from the State of Missouri, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

REPORT ON IRRIGATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, inclosing a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the results of the examinations and surveys for the location and construction of irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of the waters of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, and ordered to be printed.

CAPT. DORR F. TOZIER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that authority be granted by Congress for the acceptance by Capt. Dorrr F. Tozier, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, of the sword tendered to him by the Lords Commissioners of the British Admiralty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, stating that, pursuant to law, he has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a tabular statement showing in detail the claims of postmasters for reimbursement for losses of money orders and postal funds which have been acted upon by the Postmaster-General during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

ARTHUR G. FISK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, stating that, pursuant to law, he had transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives the claim of Arthur G. Fisk, postmaster at San Francisco, Cal., for credit on account of losses resulting from earthquake and fire; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

ALASKAN FUR-SEAL FISHERIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the report of Edwin W. Sims on the Alaskan fur-seal fisheries; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of June 26, 1906, a letter from the Act-

ing Chief of Engineers, United States Army, with inclosures, concerning the facts and data in the possession of the War Department relating to the construction of miles 19 to 23 of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal (eastern section), with particular reference to any loss or damage sustained or incurred by the Globe Construction Company. The communication will be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Attorney-General of the United States for the year 1906; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

POWER AND RESERVOIR SITES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, submitting a draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve power sites and natural reservoir sites on Indian reservations when the reservation lands are open to settlement and entry; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH INDIAN LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, submitting a draft of a bill granting the right of way through Indian lands for mill sites, electrical plants, canals, ditches, pipes and pipe lines, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JAPANESE IN SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 5th instant, certain information relative to all official letters, telegrams, reports, etc., in connection with the investigation of the matter of Japanese attending the public schools in San Francisco, Cal.; which, on motion of Mr. FLINT, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of the First Baptist Church of Helena, Ark., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Bolivar Lodge, No. 127, Free and Accepted Masons, of Stevenson, Ala., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Adorea Honore, widow and sole heir of Emile Honore, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Samuel Fitzhugh, administrator of Henry Fitzhugh, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church and Masonic Hall, of Platte City, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Mary J. Abbott, widow of William A. Abbott, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Henry L. Johnson, claimant, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Margaret P. Robinson, widow of Richard M. Robinson, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Huntsville, Ala., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Madison Female Institute *v.* The United States;

In the cause of John P. Bell, treasurer of State Hospital No. 1, of Fulton, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of J. W. Gardner, administrator of F. A. Roeder, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Milton S. Johnson, assignee of Jacob Johnson, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of G. A. Le More & Co. *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of French Creek, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of St. Albans, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of Helen A. Byington, J. E. Wyatt, J. T. Thomson, and Mollie Thomson Moore, heirs of James G. Hearst, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of William H. Ward, administrator of William H. Ward, deceased, *v.* The United States; and

In the cause of Rosa Vertner Jeffrey *v.* The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DISMISSAL OF CASES BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the order of the court dismissing the cases for want of prosecution filed in the following causes:

In the cause of Albert Grant *v.* The United States;
 In the cause of Rane C. Hutchinson *v.* The United States;
 In the cause of J. B. Cornell and others *v.* The United States;
 In the cause of Levi E. Stephens, owner of the claim of John A. Coan, *v.* The United States;
 In the cause of Edward M. Walker, administrator of Marcus Walker, deceased, *v.* The United States;
 In the cause of J. S. Underhill *v.* The United States; and
 In the cause of Daniel A. Dwight and the legal representatives of Henry W. Taylor *v.* The United States;
 The foregoing orders were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILATION CLAIM.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of opinion filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relative to the vessel brig *Sally*, Eden Wadsworth, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12318. An act to permit the protection of labor and industries from the competition of convict labor and manufacturers; and

H. R. 15335. An act for the protection of game animals, birds, and fishes in the Olympic Forest Reserve of the United States, in the State of Washington.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1804) providing for the use of certified checks to secure compliance with proposals and contracts for naval supplies; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair presents resolutions adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., December 7, 1906, relative to adequate appropriations for river and harbor improvements. Without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD, printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in convention assembled at Washington, D. C., December 7, 1906.

Congress has demanded in the past an awakened public sentiment in favor of adequate appropriations for river and harbor improvement. We maintain the awakening has come. Congress must now recognize that public sentiment in favor of increased appropriations, as voiced by convention and the press, has reached a point where the concern is not the advisability, but only the question of amount and frequency of such appropriation. Present conditions demonstrate that transportation facilities are totally inadequate for the prompt and economical transportation of the products of the country. Within the last ten years the tonnage moved by railroads has increased 47 per cent, while during the same period railway mileage has increased only 20 per cent.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are lost annually to our farmers and other producers by the failure of the National Government to provide the assistance which properly improved natural waterways will give in increased facilities for transporting freight.

We maintain that water competition is the best and surest regulation of freight rate. The improvement of rivers and construction of waterways will afford the most natural, permanent, and effective method of reducing and regulating the cost of transporting both our domestic and foreign commerce.

The saving in the cost of transportation to both the producers and the consumers of the country will, through cheaper and competitive freight rates, more than justify the expense incident thereto.

The opening of the Panama Canal, which will so greatly increase our facilities for trade with the Orient, and the awakened development of closer business relations with South American Republics, emphasizes the question of water transportation as one of national and international importance.

All progressive nations have learned by experience the imperative necessity of using natural and artificial waterways for the movement of their products and have adopted a policy of systematic development of such waterways, and the time has now arrived when the United States, with greater natural advantages, must also recognize the function of the waterway system in the economic development of this country.

Events have shown the wisdom of the resolutions adopted at our last meeting, which we now reaffirm.

The National Government having assumed the control of the rivers,

harbors, and waterways of the Republic, it owes the people the prompt and efficient discharge of such functions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate not less than \$50,000,000 annually for the improvement of rivers, harbors, and waterways, commencing with the present session of Congress.

JOS. E. RANDELL, President.

Attest:

J. F. ELLISON, Secretary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the consolidation of evidence in actions for libel; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT presented memorials of sundry librarians of the Free Library of Gloversville; of the Hobart College Library, of Geneva; of the Cornell University Library, of Ithaca; of the University of Rochester Library, of Rochester; of the Colgate University Library, of Hamilton; of the Seymour Library, of Auburn; of the Union College Library, of Schenectady; of the Vassar College Library, of Poughkeepsie, and of the New York University Library, of New York City, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rome, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Central Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a memorial of the Baptist Association of Trenton, N. J., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the librarian of the Free Public Library of Newark, N. J., and a memorial of the librarian of the Drew Theological Seminary Library, of Madison, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cliffwood, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "Littlefield original-package bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Reading Club of Rutherford, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOR, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Woodbury, N. J., praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PILES presented memorials of sundry citizens of San Juan, Cowlitz, Kelso, and Whatcom counties, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WARNER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Taneyville, Mo., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Half Rock, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 4577) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel E. Murphy; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Anaheim and Petaluma, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., and a petition of sundry citizens of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of railway postal clerks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the memorial of F. Mabel Winchell, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyrights; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 6330) to

amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., relative to the use of the phrase "county roads" in the appropriation bills, and praying that appropriations be made for the improvement of avenues, streets, or roads whether inside or outside of Florida avenue in that city; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the use of electric motors to haul trains in and out of the new Union Station in that city; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 68) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cairo, Ill., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Cottage Home, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GAMBLE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Madison, Groton, Viborg, Minnehaha County, Edgemont, Westington Springs, and Woonsocket, all in the State of South Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 6050) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Galligan; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Toledo, Multnomah County, and Portland, all in the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Richmond, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 5644) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Adams; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MALLORY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Terra Ceia, Fla., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Oak Hill, Fla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHYTE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hagerstown, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Toluca and Catawba County, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Trophy Council, No. 29, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of High Point, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BULKELEY presented a memorial of 50 citizens of Meriden, Conn., and a memorial of 8 citizens of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Baptist Convention, of Norwalk, Conn., praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of the Otis Library, of Norwich;

of the Wesleyan University Library, of Middletown; of the Free Public Library of New Haven, and of the Silas Bronson Library, of Waterbury, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. BURKETT presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 898) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Bradley; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Stanley County, N. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Saratoga, Ballston, Glens Falls, Sandy Hill, and of Orleans and Niagara counties, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPOONER presented the memorial of Horace Spear and sundry other citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of sundry colored citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that the colored race in the United States be registered as a race of Ethiopians; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of the salaries of railway postal clerks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Noank Council, Daughters of America, of Noank, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry librarians of the Otis Library, of Norwich; of the Bronson Library, of Waterbury; of the Wesleyan University Library, of Middletown, and the Public Library of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. HEMENWAY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sullivan County, Ind., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Monroe County, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of A. B. Storms, president, and the faculty of the Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the admission into this country of works of art free of duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Greenfield, Iowa, praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TALIAFERRO presented memorials of sundry citizens of Palmetto, Starke, St. Petersburg, Orlando, Lakeland, Hull, Fort Ogden, Bartow, Windsor, and Terra Ceia, all in the State of Florida, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to authorize the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of I. E. Porter and 49 other citizens of Windham County, Vt., and the memorial of Edwin D. Clayton and 49 other citizens of Hartland, Vt., re-

monstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (H. R. 18685) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Fuller; and

A bill (H. R. 19144) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Louisa Sheppard.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19293) granting an increase of pension to William Colvin;

A bill (H. R. 16856) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McBride;

A bill (H. R. 10814) granting a pension to Eugene A. Myers;

A bill (S. 6814) granting a pension to Alice Bosworth;

A bill (S. 6819) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Bigalow;

A bill (S. 677) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Peabody, jr.;

A bill (S. 6825) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Roberts;

A bill (S. 6239) granting an increase of pension to Kate M. Miner;

A bill (S. 6569) granting an increase of pension to George Porter;

A bill (S. 6568) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Hodge; and

A bill (S. 6576) granting an increase of pension to Michael Meyers.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5073) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Smith;

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to Isaac G. Clark;

A bill (S. 679) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kelly;

A bill (S. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Christopherson;

A bill (S. 6821) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan M. Adams;

A bill (S. 4182) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Smalley;

A bill (S. 6052) granting an increase of pension to William E. Redmond; and

A bill (S. 5493) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Wood.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5741) granting an increase of pension to Amelia M. Hawes;

A bill (S. 6347) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Cunningham;

A bill (S. 6230) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Paxton;

A bill (S. 4389) granting an increase of pension to Florence Plato;

A bill (S. 5725) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo S. Prather;

A bill (S. 768) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rhoads;

A bill (S. 5443) granting an increase of pension to James D. Merrill; and

A bill (S. 5980) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Smith.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. GEARIN), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19357) granting an increase of pension to Anna Lamar Walker;

A bill (H. R. 17481) granting a pension to Eliza F. Wadsworth;

A bill (H. R. 18113) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Sees;

A bill (H. R. 19416) granting an increase of pension to Antonio Macello;

A bill (H. R. 19503) granting an increase of pension to David S. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 19601) granting an increase of pension to John E. Kingsbury; and

A bill (H. R. 12667) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Weber.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. BURNHAM), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon:

A bill (H. R. 16169) granting a pension to Neal O'Donnel Parks;

A bill (S. 6561) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blair;

A bill (S. 6723) granting an increase of pension to Agusta P. Morgan;

A bill (S. 6131) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Jepson;

A bill (S. 1347) granting a pension to Martha W. Pollard; and

A bill (S. 6485) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cook.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. BURNHAM), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 16741) granting an increase of pension to William J. Girvan;

A bill (H. R. 17874) granting an increase of pension to Roseanna Hughes;

A bill (H. R. 18227) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Fitzgerald;

A bill (H. R. 19483) granting a pension to Lydia A. Patnaude;

A bill (S. 6560) granting an increase of pension to Reuben D. Dodge;

A bill (S. 6580) granting an increase of pension to Ella B. Green;

A bill (S. 6579) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Morrill;

A bill (S. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Ladd.

A bill (S. 6203) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Crommett;

A bill (S. 10) granting an increase of pension to Roswell Prescott.

A bill (S. 5727) granting an increase of pension to Lucius Rumrill;

A bill (S. 1425) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Carpenter; and

A bill (S. 1257) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Day.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. BURNHAM), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6829) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Cheney, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4205) granting an increase of pension to Amanda W. Ritchie;

A bill (H. R. 4292) granting a pension to George W. Kelley.

A bill (H. R. 5728) granting an increase of pension to William Harvey;

A bill (H. R. 6956) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 8481) granting an increase of pension to Richard Callaghan;

A bill (H. R. 19298) granting an increase of pension to Job B. Crabtree;

A bill (H. R. 19359) granting an increase of pension to Levi Brader;

A bill (H. R. 17675) granting an increase of pension to Jonas M. Sees;

A bill (H. R. 14199) granting an increase of pension to John Ewing;

A bill (H. R. 14537) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Crawford;

A bill (H. R. 19511) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Dixson;

A bill (H. R. 19611) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kinkery;

A bill (H. R. 12128) granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Litzinger;

A bill (H. R. 12339) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Murray; and

A bill (H. R. 12482) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. McLean.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 2315) granting a pension to Miranda Birkhead;

A bill (H. R. 4707) granting an increase of pension to John H. Pitman;

A bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to James W. Stewart;

A bill (H. R. 10513) granting an increase of pension to Bridget M. Duffy;

A bill (H. R. 18493) granting an increase of pension to George H. Reeder;

A bill (H. R. 11483) granting a pension to Maria Niles; and

A bill (S. 6186) granting an increase of pension to James L. Estlow.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6438) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Haller;

A bill (S. 6429) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Beardsley;

A bill (S. 5826) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Phillips; and

A bill (S. 1941) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Kelley.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1857) granting an increase of pension to William Van Tilburgh, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1871) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 8273) granting an increase of pension to John M. Pearson;

A bill (H. R. 19321) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Turner;

A bill (H. R. 19322) granting an increase of pension to Mary Isabella Rykard;

A bill (H. R. 19323) granting an increase of pension to Orlando L. Levy;

A bill (H. R. 16397) granting an increase of pension to Allie Williams;

A bill (H. R. 16747) granting a pension to Sherman Jacobs;

A bill (H. R. 16748) granting an increase of pension to Lucius C. Fletcher;

A bill (H. R. 18429) granting an increase of pension to David Mitchell;

A bill (H. R. 18860) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 19119) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Osborn; and

A bill (H. R. 13057) granting an increase of pension to James S. Salsberry.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6538) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Hodges; and

A bill (S. 5138) granting a pension to Jane Metts.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6353) granting an increase of pension to Dolores S. Foster, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19528) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Maddox; and

A bill (S. 2749) granting an increase of pension to John H. Brooks.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19300) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Easley;

A bill (H. R. 17691) granting an increase of pension to George W. Henrie;

A bill (H. R. 18193) granting an increase of pension to Walden Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 18403) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Ragan;

A bill (H. R. 19080) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Fienop;

A bill (H. R. 14480) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Moore;

A bill (H. R. 19587) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Jones;

A bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Farrar; and

A bill (S. 6466) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Moser.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6267) granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Manning, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GEARIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4406) granting an increase of pension to Susan N. Fowler, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6636) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Grover, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4053) granting an increase of pension to William A. Smith; and

A bill (S. 6250) granting a pension to Alice G. Clark.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 18018) granting an increase of pension to David Evans;

A bill (H. R. 18066) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Fergus;

A bill (H. R. 14680) granting an increase of pension to Sampson Parker;

A bill (H. R. 11142) granting an increase of pension to James McQuade;

A bill (H. R. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Charles Martine;

A bill (H. R. 19162) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Tine;

A bill (H. R. 19161) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Tenney;

A bill (H. R. 16342) granting a pension to Matilda Foster;

A bill (H. R. 12190) granting an increase of pension to Milton R. Dungan;

A bill (S. 6718) granting an increase of pension to Augustus L. Holbrook;

A bill (S. 6705) granting an increase of pension to Holmes Clayton;

A bill (S. 6707) granting an increase of pension to Stephen E. Lemon; and

A bill (S. 6709) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shawver.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6717) granting an increase of pension to Manasa T. Houser; and

A bill (S. 1891) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. M. Morgan.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Reynolds; and

A bill (S. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. Janes.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4689) granting an increase of pension to James Reeder;

A bill (H. R. 4690) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Slinger;

A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George Fetterman;

A bill (H. R. 19404) granting an increase of pension to Elias S. Falkenburg;

A bill (H. R. 18045) granting an increase of pension to John M. Webb;

A bill (H. R. 18214) granting an increase of pension to John Ingram;

A bill (H. R. 19743) granting an increase of pension to W. P. McMichael;

A bill (H. R. 19744) granting an increase of pension to George Casper Homan Hummel, alias George C. Homan; and

A bill (H. R. 9836) granting an increase of pension to Dier Collett.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19462) granting an increase of pension to Emily Fox;

A bill (S. 2734) granting an increase of pension to John R. Conyngham; and

A bill (S. 822) granting a pension to Michael V. Hennessy.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3338) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Franks;

A bill (H. R. 5846) granting an increase of pension to John M. Chandler;

A bill (H. R. 16211) granting an increase of pension to John W. Montgomery;

A bill (H. R. 19463) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Patterson;

A bill (H. R. 19534) granting an increase of pension to Noah Resseque;

A bill (H. R. 19626) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Campbell;

A bill (H. R. 19922) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Sutherland;

A bill (H. R. 9465) granting a pension to Ella Q. Parish;

A bill (H. R. 12517) granting a pension to William Bays;

A bill (S. 2737) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Hains; and

A bill (S. 4909) granting an increase of pension to Louis Sidel.

Mr. CARMACK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19889) granting an increase of pension to John M. Melson;

A bill (H. R. 19415) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Reavis;

A bill (H. R. 14144) granting a pension to Allen M. Cameron;

A bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to James W. Russell;

A bill (H. R. 19529) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Elizabeth Hutcheson;

A bill (H. R. 19530) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Gray;

A bill (H. R. 19324) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Long;

A bill (H. R. 19325) granting an increase of pension to George Oppel;

A bill (H. R. 19326) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Vandiver;

A bill (H. R. 15620) granting an increase of pension to David D. Owens;

A bill (H. R. 17651) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Riley;

A bill (H. R. 19514) granting an increase of pension to James H. Stimpson; and

A bill (H. R. 15619) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Atkinson.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 19035) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore Morgan; and

A bill (S. 4894) granting an increase of pension to Robert Ramsey.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 8712) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall;

A bill (H. R. 19174) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Billings;

A bill (H. R. 19256) granting an increase of pension to Louisa J. Birthright;

A bill (H. R. 19318) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rivers;

A bill (H. R. 19319) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Spruell;

A bill (H. R. 19320) granting an increase of pension to Louise J. Pratt;

A bill (H. R. 15713) granting an increase of pension to William McCrea.

A bill (H. R. 17918) granting a pension to Walter S. Harman.

A bill (H. R. 18343) granting an increase of pension to John N. Oliver;

A bill (H. R. 18705) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Page;

A bill (H. R. 19101) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. A. Scott;

A bill (H. R. 19504) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Walker;

A bill (H. R. 19819) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Kearney; and

A bill (S. 6035) granting an increase of pension to John Fox.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6232) granting an increase of pension to John L. Anthony; and

A bill (S. 6001) granting an increase of pension to Emily Kilian.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 6898) concerning licensed officers of vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6899) granting an increase of pension to George H. Nye;

A bill (S. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Orrel Brown;

A bill (S. 6901) granting an increase of pension to Alvin S. Doughty (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6902) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus B. Taylor (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 6903) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6904) for the purchase of a site for a Federal building for the United States post-office at Laconia, N. H.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 6905) authorizing the extension of T street NW;

A bill (S. 6906) to provide for the incorporation of banks within the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6907) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations," approved June 19, 1906 (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6908) to regulate the production and sale of milk and cream in and for the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6909) granting an increase of pension to William H. Adams;

A bill (S. 6910) granting an increase of pension to George F. Chamberlin;

A bill (S. 6911) granting an increase of pension to George A. Boyle;

A bill (S. 6912) granting an increase of pension to James G. Harvey; and

A bill (S. 6913) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Mordough.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BURNHAM) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6914) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Barr;

A bill (S. 6915) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Healy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6916) granting an increase of pension to Nathan E. Stover (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6917) granting a pension to Thomas A. Parker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6918) granting an increase of pension to Edward Prince;

A bill (S. 6919) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Pendell (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6920) granting an increase of pension to John N. Williams.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 6921) to correct the military record of Hiram Van Buren; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6922) granting an increase of pension to Rufus J. Henderson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 6923) for the better protection of packages sent through the mails; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6924) to correct the military record of William S. Russell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6925) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. Shattuck;

A bill (S. 6926) restoring to the pension roll the name of Caroline Kurtz, widow of John Kurtz (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6927) granting an increase of pension to David Coble (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6928) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Dewees (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6929) granting an increase of pension to William C. Todd (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6930) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Sidell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6931) granting a pension to Eli W. Elzey (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6932) authorizing a change in the form of paying pensioners.

Mr. DEPEW introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6933) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Middaugh; and

A bill (S. 6934) granting an increase of pension to Michael Hogan.

Mr. ANKENY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6935) granting an increase of pension to W. R. Neil; and

A bill (S. 6936) granting an increase of pension to Robert Jenkins.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 6937) granting an increase of pension to Michael Rosbrugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6938) granting a pension to Josephine Sinclair;

A bill (S. 6939) granting a pension to William Y. Rohrbach; and

A bill (S. 6940) granting a pension to Andrew T. Blowvelt.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 6941) for the relief of Capt. Thomas Mason, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired); which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NELSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6942) granting an increase of pension to William B. Dow; and

A bill (S. 6943) granting an increase of pension to L. A. Grant.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 6944) authorizing the

President of the United States to select from the retired list of the Army an officer not above the rank of brigadier-general who may have distinguished himself during the civil war, throughout twenty-five years of Indian wars, through the Spanish-American war, and the insurrection in the Philippine Islands, and to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the officer so selected to be major-general, United States Army, with the pay and allowances established by law for officers of that grade on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6945) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6946) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6947) granting an increase of pension to C. M. Brough (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6948) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Nash (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6949) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wallace (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6950) granting an increase of pension to John A. Van Pelt.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6951) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Greenley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6952) granting an increase of pension to Martin A. Rubert (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6953) granting a pension to Alice A. Johnson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6954) granting an increase of pension to Henry Matter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6955) granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Vandel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6956) granting an increase of pension to Eli Ford, alias Jacob Butler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6957) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Siegfried (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6958) granting an increase of pension to Keiziah Walker;

A bill (S. 6959) granting a pension to Julia F. Fibbs (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6960) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ashton (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 6961) to authorize the sale of the unallotted and unreserved portion of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Rust (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6963) granting an increase of pension to William B. Sayles; and

A bill (S. 6964) granting an increase of pension to Silas N. Palmer.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 6965) granting an increase of pension to Amos Vance; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 6966) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6967) to enlarge the public building at Rome, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6968) for the relief of the Academy of Richmond County, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6969) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Mathews;

A bill (S. 6970) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo W. Fuller;

A bill (S. 6971) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Daugherty;

A bill (S. 6972) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Capansky;

A bill (S. 6973) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Harbours;

A bill (S. 6974) granting an increase of pension to Judson E. Cole;

A bill (S. 6975) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Deweese (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6976) granting an increase of pension to Frank Smyth; and

A bill (S. 6977) granting an increase of pension to William McCarthy.

Mr. GEARIN introduced a bill (S. 6978) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jackson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 6979) for the relief of the trustees of the Union Presbyterian Church, of Cross Keys, Va. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6980) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Falls Church, Va. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6981) for the relief of the trustees of Tabernacle Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Culpeper County, Va.;

A bill (S. 6982) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of the town of Culpeper, Culpeper County, Va.; and

A bill (S. 6983) for the relief of the trustees of Providence Church, of Culpeper County, Va.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 6984) to remove from the estate of William J. Cussen, deceased, and from any real estate aliened by him during his lifetime, a cloud resting on the same by reason of a state judgment of the United States of America; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6985) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Crisman (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6986) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Beatty (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. LATIMER introduced a bill (S. 6987) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Gregg Shoals; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 6988) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Abbeville, in the State of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 6989) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Aiken, in the State of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 6990) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Gaffney, in the State of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 6991) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Union, in the State of South Carolina; and

A bill (S. 6992) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Laurens, in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. LATIMER introduced a bill (S. 6993) to create the Barnaby road, from its intersection with the Livingston road to the District line, a public highway in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 6994) for the relief of the estate of Mary S. Porter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KNOX introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6995) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; and

A bill (S. 6996) granting an increase of pension to John Snyder (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BULKELEY introduced a bill (S. 6997) granting an in-

crease of pension to William Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 6998) for the relief of T. L. Love, surviving partner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6999) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ogle;

A bill (S. 7000) granting an increase of pension to Saline E. West;

A bill (S. 7001) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Nowell;

A bill (S. 7002) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Livingston; and

A bill (S. 7003) granting an increase of pension to Martha Holder.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 7004) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Burnet; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7005) granting an increase of pension to John Schenk;

A bill (S. 7006) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester M. Johnson;

A bill (S. 7007) granting an increase of pension to Julius Speyer, alias Paul Haber;

A bill (S. 7008) granting a pension to Frederick Lutz;

A bill (S. 7009) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Oldfield;

A bill (S. 7010) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Atkinson;

A bill (S. 7011) granting an increase of pension to William W. Scott;

A bill (S. 7012) granting an increase of pension to George A. Miller;

A bill (S. 7013) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jester;

A bill (S. 7014) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Hammons;

A bill (S. 7015) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Proffett; and

A bill (S. 7016) granting an increase of pension to Commodore P. Barker.

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 7017) extending the time for making final proof and payment on public lands in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 7018) for the relief of Harry C. Adkins, alias Tim Hamlin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7019) granting an increase of pension to John McConnell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7020) granting an increase of pension to William B. Cole; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 7021) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. McJunkin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7022) granting an increase of pension to Davis M. Clark; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 7023) for the relief of Thomas J. Akins, assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced a bill (S. 7024) granting an increase of pension to Darius Ault; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 7025) granting a pension to James C. West; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 7026) to provide for the issuance of emergency circulation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 7027) to amend an

act entitled "An act to further protect the public health and make more effective the national quarantine," approved June 19, 1906; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 7028) for the relief of the Allis-Chalmers Company, of Milwaukee, Wis.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7029) granting an increase of pension to James M. Eddy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 7030) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Paris, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7031) for the relief of the session of the Presbyterian Church of Perryville, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7032) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church and the Green River Masonic Lodge, No. 88, of Munfordville, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 7033) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Harrodsburg, Ky.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 7034) to incorporate the International Sunday School Association of America; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7035) granting an increase of pension to William Hobbs;

A bill (S. 7036) granting an increase of pension to Scott Graves; and

A bill (S. 7037) granting an increase of pension to John H. Carter (with accompanying papers).

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 78) authorizing and empowering the President of the United States to abate and suppress the continued shameful and cruel practice of killing nursing mother fur seals on the high seas, now permitted and conducted; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

HISTORY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL CEMETERY.

Mr. BURKETT. At Thursday's session an order was made to print a statement pertaining to the Congressional Cemetery, prepared by the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. There is a small map covering the half dozen blocks of the cemetery, and the map can not be printed without an order of the Senate. I ask that the map may be printed with the document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHARLES H. PENDLETON.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of S. 2581, "authorizing the President to appoint Charles H. Pendleton a lieutenant-commander on the retired list, United States Navy," Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, there having been no adverse report thereon.

AFFAIRS OF THE KONGO FREE STATE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the reports of the inhuman treatment inflicted upon the native inhabitants of the Kongo Free State have been of such a nature and so well sustained as to draw the attention of the civilized world and excite both the indignation and the compassion of the people of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate of the United States the time has come when the affairs of the Kongo Free State should be made the subject of international inquiry, and the Senate respectfully advises the President that in any steps he may deem it wise to take in cooperation with or in aid of any of the powers, signatories of the treaty of Berlin, which shall seek to ameliorate the conditions of the Kongo Free State and redress any evils now existent there he will receive its cordial support.

MESSANGER FOR COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided for.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN SCHOONER SILAS STEARNS.

Mr. MALLORY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the Senate copies of all papers, documents, and correspondence now in the possession of the Department of State relating to the seizure and forcible detention of the American fishing schooner *Silas Stearns* by the Mexican authorities; and to inform the Senate whether said schooner has been adjudged forfeited by the decree of any Mexican court, and if so, whether the owners of said schooner were ever given an opportunity, by citation or otherwise, to appear in said court and defend their property; and also to inform the Senate of the present status of said case and what action, if any, has been taken by this Government in the premises.

THREE COMPANIES OF TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether Companies B, C, and D, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, or either of them, were, prior to August 13, 1906, involved in any riot, raid, or other disturbance with citizens, and if so, to inform the Senate when and where it occurred and its character fully, accompanying his report with copies of all official correspondence on the subject.

FRANCISCO KREBS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? If not, the morning business is closed.

Mr. MONEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 3300, which is the bill (S. 5531) for the relief of Francisco Krebs.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I rise only to suggest that after the matter which the Senator from Mississippi has in hand shall have been disposed of I think it would be well to go to the Calendar under Rule VIII for the consideration of unobjected cases, and then all Senators will have an equal chance on the Calendar. I will not, however, make that suggestion until the Senator is through with his bill.

Mr. MONEY. The bill which I desire to call up will take but little time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported by the Committee on Private Land Claims with an amendment.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I want to say there is a misprint in the bill. Somewhere there you will find a provision reading, "Comprising 400 feet square, upon which the legislature is now situated," etc. That is a misprint. I ask that a verbal correction may be made by inserting the word "light-house" for the word "legislature."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The error to which the Senator directs attention is in the committee amendment.

Mr. MONEY. Yes, sir.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the Committee on Private Land Claims will be stated with that correction.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following:

Provided further, That the site comprising 400 feet square upon which the light-house is now situated shall be excepted from this confirmation.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Francisco Krebs be, and he is hereby, confirmed in his title to a tract of land known as Round Island, in the State of Mississippi, situated in sections 33 and 34, township 8 south, range 6 west, and sections 3 and 4, township 9 south, range 6 west, granted by the Spanish governor, Grimarest, to Francisco Krebs on December 13, 1783, and recorded in translated records, book No. 2, page 51, in the probate court at Mobile, Ala.; *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall affect the claim or claims of any other person or persons to the said land, or any part thereof, derived from the United States or any source whatever; *Provided further*, That the site comprising 400 feet square upon which the light-house is now situated shall be excepted from this confirmation.

Mr. MORGAN. Is the consideration of that bill open to objection, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is now before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole for consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. I shall have to object to it and ask that it go over. It seems to relate to Mobile.

Mr. MONEY. It has no relation whatever to Mobile. It merely refers to the court at Mobile.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg pardon, and withdraw the suggestion I made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 12318. An act to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the several States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 15335. An act for the protection of game animals, birds, and fishes in the Olympic Forest Reserve of the United States, in the State of Washington was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Reservations and the Protection of Game.

BRITISH SCHOONER LILLIE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in the claim of the British schooner *Lillie*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

LIEUT. COL. L. K. SCOTT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. KEAN, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning the claim of Lieut. Col. L. K. Scott, a British subject, on account of the adoption by the Ordnance Department of the United States Army of a system of sighting of which he is the inventor.

In view of the recognition by the Chief of Ordnance of the Army of the equitable right of Lieutenant-Colonel Scott to payment for the use of his invention, I recommend that provision be made by Congress for the payment of this claim.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

GORDON, IRONSIDES & FARES COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in regard to the application of the British embassy, in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company, of Canada, for reimbursement in the sum of \$7,626.08, which they allege the United States customs authorities improperly exacted of them in November, 1902, as duties on certain sheep and cattle.

I renew the recommendation which I made to the Congress on January 12, 1904, that, in view of the facts shown in the correspondence, provision be made for the company's reimbursement.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

EASTERN EXTENSION AUSTRALASIA AND CHINA TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, with reference to the claim of the Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company for compensation on account of expenses incurred in repairing its Manila-Hongkong and Manila-Capiz cables, which were cut by the United States forces during the war with Spain.

I renew the recommendation made by President McKinley, that as an act of equity and comity provision be made by the Congress for reimbursement to the company of the actual expenses incurred by it in the repair of the cables.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

ORDINANCES OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying letter of the Secretary of State, ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying ordinances, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico:

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution approved May 1, 1900, I transmit herewith five ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

XLI—13

The attention of Congress is invited to the statement of the Secretary of State that the transmission of these ordinances does not imply any request that they be printed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith nine ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

AMERICAN SAILING VESSELS IN COASTING TRADE.

Mr. FRYE. The second bill on the Calendar is the bill (S. 30) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade, known as the "pilotage bill." A similar bill has just been defeated by quite a majority in the House of Representatives. Therefore there is no object at all in the Senate sending this bill to the House, and I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

LEASES IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

The bill (S. 4433) to amend an act approved August 3, 1894, entitled "An act concerning leases in the Yellowstone National Park," was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate resumed its consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. This bill has heretofore passed the Senate, but the vote by which it was passed was subsequently reconsidered.

Mr. CARTER. I ask that the bill may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I think that bill has been passed, and that the question now is on its reconsideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the vote by which it was passed was reconsidered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Then, certainly the bill has been read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been heretofore read.

Mr. CARTER. The bill was passed at the last session. I understand that it fixes a period of twenty years' limitation instead of ten.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry, having been absent when the last action was taken upon this bill, as to whether section 3 of the bill as we have it before us was amended by inserting after the word "shall" the words "to be in effect only a chattel mortgage?"

I had some conversation with the Senator from Montana in charge of the bill in regard to the matter before my enforced absence from the Senate, and called his attention to the fact that I had no objection to the enactment of this measure, except that I did not want the mortgage authorized to be made to be recognized as a real estate mortgage, because this property is partly in Idaho, partly in Wyoming, and partly in Montana; and the laws of those States regarding the status or the method of foreclosing a mortgage are somewhat different.

Then, again, I did not want to see this measure recognize the right of the Secretary of the Interior or of any other person to place a burden upon the land of a national park. If this is declared to be a chattel mortgage that shall apply only to the buildings, treating them as chattels placed upon the realty under the permission given by this bill, then I should have no objection to it; but I would object to a mortgage partaking of the nature of a mortgage upon real property being authorized at all, because the title to this property is in the United States, and Congress may do what it sees fit with that title. If Congress authorizes the making of a mortgage that would have the effect of being a mortgage upon real property, we would then jeopardize a part of the title to a great national park. I think for precaution in section 3, line 12, on page 2 of the bill, after the word "shall," the words "be in effect only a chattel mort-

gage" will leave no question of doubt as to the character of that incumbency. Otherwise the bill ought not to pass.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Those words were inserted in the bill as it was agreed to at the last session.

Mr. HEYBURN. It was during my absence, and the bill before me does not indicate it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the bill first passed the Senate without the words to which the Senator refers. The only difference between that bill and the unamended text of this bill rests in the difference of the duration of the lease period.

As I understood the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to be that unobjected cases alone should be considered, and inasmuch as the question raised by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] would lead to some extended explanation, I ask that the bill may now go over.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not intend to send the bill over by my statement. I merely rose to inquire as to its status. I understood the Senator from Montana to state that his recollection was that this amendment had not been made, and the Chair states that it has been made, as I understand. If that amendment has been made, then I have no objection to interpose, and am willing that the bill shall proceed to final enactment.

Mr. CARTER. Then, if that amendment has been made, I should be constrained to ask the Senate to disagree to it for reasons which I think will appeal very forcibly to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. LODGE. Let the bill go over, Mr. President.

Mr. CARTER. Inasmuch as the explanation would require time, I shall ask that the bill now go over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the bill goes over I would ask the Senator if he would have any objection to inserting in line 4, after the word "lease," the words "in his discretion?"

Mr. CARTER. No; not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I would move that amendment before the bill goes over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, on page 1, line 4, after the word "lease," it is proposed to insert "in his discretion."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over, and the next unobjected bill on the Calendar will be stated.

PENSIONS FOR NINETY DAYS' SERVICE.

The bill (S. 976) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the war of the rebellion was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, that bill will require some discussion, and I ask that it be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

AGREEMENT WITH YANKTON SIOUX INDIANS.

The bill (S. 2993) to ratify an agreement with the Yankton Sioux Indians of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, is there a report accompanying that bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a report accompanying the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Then I ask that the report may be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a very long report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read at the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. GAMBLE from the Committee on Indian Affairs April 4, 1906.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I have discovered what I desired to find out from the report. Therefore I withdraw my request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey withdraws his request, and the further reading of the report will be dispensed with.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over. I can briefly state my reasons for making the request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been passed. Does the Senator from Minnesota ask that it go over?

Mr. NELSON. I desire, if there be no objection, to make a statement showing why I ask that the bill go over.

The bill proposes to appropriate \$100,000 to these Indians for

a section of land. I have been on that land, and I know what it is. It is just a piece of prairie. There are some of these pipestone quarries there to which the Indians go and get stone to make pipes and other ornaments. It seems to me a hundred thousand dollars for that section of land is out of all proportion to its real value. I do not think it is a fair deal on the part of the Government. For that reason I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. President, this matter has been pending for some time. The bill has the favorable recommendation of the Department. If the Senator from Minnesota will examine the report, he will see that the question of value was raised. Some of the experts who had knowledge of the land placed its value of \$140, \$150, and some as high as \$200 per acre. I do not pretend to have knowledge concerning its value except what is stated in the report. It contains one section of land, and has stone quarries of unusual value situated upon it. They are the famous pipestone quarries.

Mr. NELSON. I saw this very land. I have seen the pipestone quarries; and it seems to me a hundred thousand dollars for that section of land, which is practically good for nothing else except for these pipestone rocks, is quite out of all proportion.

Mr. GAMBLE. I will state that the Government has appropriated a part of this land and has erected valuable school buildings thereon. The land is adjacent to the city of Pipestone, a prosperous city of some size. As I have heretofore stated, I have no other knowledge concerning the value of the land than that derived from the report. The agreement has been pending for some time and the matter ought to be disposed of.

Mr. NELSON. That is a small town of between two and three thousand people, and it is not a very growing town. This land is a piece of prairie, with nothing but this pipestone quarry on it, and it seems to me that a hundred thousand dollars for it is out of all proportion. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion, the bill having been passed, that it is beyond the reach of a single objection.

Mr. NELSON. I was not aware the bill had been passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been passed.

Mr. NELSON. Then I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota moves to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator from South Dakota in charge of the bill if he objects to having the vote by which the Senate passed the bill reconsidered?

Mr. GAMBLE. No.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator does not?

Mr. GAMBLE. No.

Mr. CULBERSON. Then I have nothing to say.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will lie over. The next bill on the Calendar will be stated.

EXTENSION OF GENESEO PLACE AND SUMMIT PLACE.

The bill (S. 5246) to provide for the extension of Genesee place, District of Columbia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 3, before the word "days," to strike out "thirty" and insert "ninety;" in line 10, after the word "southwesterly," to strike out "and westerly direction to Eighteenth street, so as to connect with Summit place" and insert "direction in prolongation of its present lines and to extend Summit place in an easterly direction with a width of 40 feet to connect with said extension of Genesee place, said extension of Summit place to be north of northerly line of lot 198 of Lanier Heights and said line extended;" so as to make the section read:

That within ninety days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia, sitting as a district court, by petition, particularly describing the lands to be taken, a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the extension of Genesee place, Lanier Heights NW., in said District, in a southwesterly direction in prolongation of its present lines and to extend Summit place in an easterly direction with a width of 40 feet to connect with said extension of Genesee place, said extension of Summit place to be north of northerly line of lot 198 of Lanier Heights and said line extended; the name of Genesee place to be changed to Summit place.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 9, after the word "said," to strike out "street such amount thereof"

and insert "streets;" and in line 20, after the word "said," to strike out "street: *Provided*, That if the aggregate amount of the benefits to be assessed, as determined by said jury pursuant to the provisions hereof, is less than one-half of the amount of the damages awarded for and in respect of the land condemned, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, in their discretion, reject the award and assessment of the jury, and all proceedings thereunder shall be null and void" and insert "streets. If the total amount of the damages awarded by the jury and the costs and expenses of the proceeding be in excess of the total amount of the assessments for benefits, such excess shall be borne and paid by the District of Columbia;" so as to make the section read:

Sec. 2. That of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land condemned for the extension of the said streets shall be assessed by the jury hereinafter provided as benefits, and to the extent of such benefits, against those pieces or parcels of ground on each side of said streets, and also against any or all pieces or parcels of land which may be benefited by the opening of said street as said jury may find said pieces or parcels of land will be benefited; and in determining the amounts to be assessed against said pieces or parcels of land the jury shall take into consideration the respective situations of such pieces or parcels of land and the benefits they may severally receive from the opening or extension of the said streets. If the total amount of the damages awarded by the jury and the costs and expenses of the proceeding be in excess of the total amount of the assessments for benefits, such excess shall be borne and paid by the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 4, to strike out the first word, "street," in line 9, and insert "streets;" in line 22, after the word "said," to strike out "street" and insert "streets;" and in line 1, page 5, after the word "said," to strike out "street" and insert "streets."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 5, line 8, after the word "said," to strike out "street" and insert "streets."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 6, line 4, after the words "by the," to strike out "Treasurer of the United States, ex-officio commissioner of the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, upon the warrant of the Commissioners of said District, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia" and insert "disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia;" so as to make the section read:

Sec. 7. That when the verdict of said jury shall have been finally ratified and confirmed by the court, as herein provided, the amounts of money awarded and adjudged to be payable for lands taken under the provisions hereof shall be paid to the owners of said land by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 8, line 4, after the word "such," to strike out "street" and insert "streets;" and in line 7, after the word "said," to strike out "street" and insert "streets."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the extension of Genesee place and Summit place, District of Columbia."

HENRY O. BASSETT.

The bill (S. 4323) for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Henry O. Bassett, sole surviving heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased, the sum of \$142.59.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INHABITANTS OF PORTO RICO.

The bill (S. 2620) to provide that the inhabitants of Porto Rico shall be citizens of the United States was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. Let this bill, which will give rise to debate, be sent to the Calendar under Rule IX.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Maine the bill will go to the Calendar under Rule IX.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR PUBLIC PARKS.

The bill (S. 5201) to acquire certain land in the District of Columbia as an addition to Rock Creek Park was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, in section 2, page 2, line 3, after the word "acquired," to insert "and the location of proposed new streets;" so as to read:

Sec. 2. That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, hereinafter referred to as the board of control of Rock Creek Park, shall cause to be made an accurate map of said pieces and parcels of land showing the location, quantity, and character of each piece and parcel of private property to be acquired, and the location of proposed new streets, which map shall be filed and recorded in the public records of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 18, after the word "therefrom," to insert "along the center of a proposed new street;" and in line 20, after the word "line," to insert "following the center line of a proposed new street;" so as to read:

Thence southeasterly and parallel to said center line of Cleveland avenue and 325 feet distant therefrom along the center of a proposed new street to the point where said line intersects the center line of Twentieth street; thence southeasterly by reverse curved line, following the center line of a proposed new street, to the intersection of the center line of Rock Creek drive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 6, line 7, after the word "plan," to strike out "as 90 feet in width;" and in line 9, after the word "are," to strike out "not;" and in the same line, after the words "provided for," to strike out "in said plan" and insert "herein;" so as to read:

And shall, in addition to such conveyance and dedication and in the same deed, enter into an agreement to establish building-restriction lines to agree with the street lines, as shown on said highway plan, or where any new street or streets are provided for herein, the said building-restriction lines to be of a width of 15 feet adjacent to the dedicated portion of the street, the intent of this act being that the width of such street or streets included within such building-restriction lines shall be 90 feet.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, for the purpose of providing a reservation for a public park, the several parcels of ground in the District of Columbia included between Euclid street, Columbia avenue or Fifteenth street, W street or Florida avenue, and Sixteenth street extended, in Hall and Elvan's subdivision of Meridian Hill, containing in the aggregate 437,000 square feet, more or less; and to pay for the said land and premises so taken, and the improvements thereon, the sum of \$550,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That one-half of the said sum of \$550,000, or so much thereof as may be expended, shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in four equal annual installments, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum upon the deferred payments: *And provided further*, That one half of the sum that shall be annually appropriated and expended for the maintenance and improvement of said lands as a public park shall be charged against and paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in the same manner now provided by law in respect to other appropriations for the District of Columbia, and the other half shall be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States. In case said parcels of ground can not be obtained by purchase at a price satisfactory to said Secretary of the Interior the same shall be condemned in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 8. That the Attorney-General, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized and directed to make application to the supreme court of the District of Columbia, by petition, at a general or special term of said court, for an assessment of the value of said parcels of ground, and said petition shall contain a particular description of the property required, with the name of the owner or owners thereof, and his, her, or their residence, as far as the same can be ascertained, and the said court is hereby authorized and required, upon such application, without delay, to notify the owners and occupants of each such parcel, and to ascertain and assess the value of the same by appointing three commissioners to appraise the values thereof and to return the assessment to the court; and when the values of such parcels are thus ascertained and the said Secretary of the Interior shall deem the same reasonable the sum or sums so ascertained shall be paid into said court for their use. That the fee simple of all premises so appropriated for public use under the provisions hereof, and of which an appraisal shall have been made under the order and by direction of said court, shall upon payment into the said court as aforesaid of the amount so ascertained and assessed as to each parcel be thereupon vested fully in the United States, and the right of possession thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 9. That the said court may direct the time and manner in which possession of the property condemned shall be taken or delivered, and may, if necessary, enforce any order or issue any process for giving possession. The cost occasioned by the said condemnation proceedings shall be paid from the Treasury of the United States, out of any money not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That one-half of the said cost shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in four equal annual installments, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum upon the deferred payments. Other costs which may arise in the said proceedings shall be paid as the court may direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 10. That whenever and as title to the several parcels of such real estate shall be acquired as aforesaid and the same shall be ready for delivery, and the sufficiency thereof shall be certified by the Attorney-General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon the requisition of the said Secretary of the Interior, to pay into court the condemnation price of such property, parcel by parcel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 11. That the public park authorized and established by this act shall be under the joint control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to acquire certain land in the District of Columbia as an addition to Rock Creek Park and in Hall and Elvan's subdivision of Meridian Hill for a public park."

ADMINISTRATION OF RECLAMATION ACT.

The bill (H. R. 17833) providing for the administration of the operations of the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the "reclamation act," was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to the bill just announced. There is a memorandum on the bill stating that the Senator from New Hampshire, among others, desired to be present when the bill came up. The name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] also appears.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the bill would better go over, Mr. President. I have an objection to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

BOUNDARY LINE OF ROCK CREEK PARK.

The bill (S. 823) to rectify the boundary line of Rock Creek Park was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

The bill (S. 1751) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of captured and abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States and acts amendatory thereof was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. KEAN. Let it go to the Calendar under Rule IX.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under Rule IX; that is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the Calendar under Rule IX.

CHILD LABOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, let the bill go over, retaining its place.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from West Virginia, the bill will go over, retaining its place.

Mr. DUBOIS. I move that the bill be taken up, notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from West Virginia. There is no child-labor law in the District of Columbia. This is a model bill. It has been objected to two or three times. It has passed the House, and is unanimously reported from the Committee on Education and Labor in the Senate. I move that the bill be taken up, notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NELSON. I make the point of order that the motion is not in order. We agreed by unanimous consent to proceed with the Calendar and to take up only unobjected bills.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill, notwithstanding the objection, is in order under the rule. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just announced, notwithstanding the objection. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it.

Mr. SCOTT. I call for the yeas and nays.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia demands the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

Mr. BACON. Is it in order to ask for the reading of the bill for information?

Mr. LODGE. It is the child-labor bill, which was up at the last session of Congress.

Mr. BACON. I understand.

Mr. LODGE. And it was then read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. It is the bill which passed the House.

Mr. BACON. I should like, before voting on the question of consideration, to know what are the terms of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill at the request of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the amendment of the committee, which is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert, be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. The amendment reported by the Committee on Education and Labor is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That no child under 14 years of age shall be employed, permitted, or suffered to work in the District of Columbia in any factory, workshop, mercantile establishment, store, business office, telegraph office, restaurant, hotel, apartment house, theater, bowling alley, or in the distribution or transmission of merchandise or messages, or selling newspapers. No such child shall be employed in any work performed for wages or other compensation, to whomsoever payable, during the hours when the public schools of the District of Columbia are in session, nor before the hour of 6 o'clock in the morning or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the evening.

SEC. 2. That no child under 16 years of age shall be employed, permitted, or suffered to work in the District of Columbia in any of the establishments named in section 1, unless the person or corporation employing him procures and keeps on file and accessible to the inspectors authorized by this act and the truant officers of the District of Columbia an age and schooling certificate, and keeps two complete lists of all such children employed therein, one on file and one conspicuously posted near the principal entrance of the building in which such children are employed.

SEC. 3. That an age and schooling certificate shall be approved only by the superintendent of public schools, or by a person authorized by him in writing, who shall have authority to administer the oath provided for therein, but no fee shall be charged therefor.

SEC. 4. That an age and schooling certificate shall not be approved unless satisfactory evidence is furnished by duly attested transcript of the certificate of birth or baptism of such child, or other religious record, or the register of birth or the affidavit of the parent or guardian or custodian of a child, which affidavit shall be required, however, only in case such last-mentioned transcript of the certificate of birth be not procured and filed, showing the place and date of birth of such child, which affidavit must be taken before the officer issuing the employment certificate, who is hereby authorized and required to administer such oath, and who shall not demand or receive a fee therefor.

SEC. 5. That the age and schooling certificate of a child under 16 years of age shall be in the following form:

AGE AND SCHOOLING CERTIFICATE.

This certifies that I am the (father, mother, guardian, or custodian) of (name of child) ——— and that (he or she) was born at (name of town or city) ——— in the county (name of county, if known) ——— and State (or country) of ——— on the day (day and year of birth) ——— and is now (number of years and months) ——— old.

Signature of (father, mother, guardian, or custodian).
(Date.)

There personally appeared before me the above-named (name of person signing) ——— and made oath that the foregoing certificate by (him or her) signed is true to the best of (his or her) knowledge and belief. I hereby approve the foregoing certificate of (name of child) ———, height (feet and inches) ———, eyes (color) ———, complexion (fair or dark) ———, hair (color) ———, having no sufficient reason to doubt that (he or she) is of the age therein certified, I hereby certify that (he or she) can read at sight and can write legibly simple sentences in the English language, and that (he or she) has reached the normal development of a child of (his or her) age, and is in sound health and is physically able to perform the work which (he or she) intends to do, and that (he or she) has regularly attended the public schools, or a school equivalent thereto, for not less than one hundred and thirty days during the school year previous to arriving at the age of 14 years, or during the year previous to applying for such school record, and has received during such period instruction in reading, spelling, writing, English grammar, and geography, and is familiar with the fundamental operations of arithmetic, to and including fractions.

This certificate belongs to (name of child in whose behalf it is drawn) ——— and is to be surrendered to (him or her) whenever (he or she) leaves the service of the corporation or employer hold-

ing the same; but if not claimed by said child within thirty days from such time it shall be returned to the superintendent of schools.

(Signature of person authorized to approve and sign, with official character or authority.)

(Date.)

A duplicate of each age and schooling certificate shall be filled out and kept on file by the superintendent of public schools. Any explanatory matter may be printed with such certificate, in the discretion of said superintendent.

SEC. 6. That whoever employs a child under 16 years of age, and whoever having under his control a child under such age permits such child to be employed, in violation of sections 1, 2, 8, or 9 of this act, shall, for such offense, be fined not more than \$50; and whoever continues to employ any child in violation of any of said sections of this act, after being notified by an inspector authorized by this act, or a truant officer of the District of Columbia, shall for every day thereafter that such employment continues be fined not less than \$5 nor more than \$20. A failure to produce to an inspector authorized by this act, or a truant officer of the District of Columbia, any age or schooling certificate or list required by this act shall be prima facie evidence of illegal employment of any person whose age and schooling certificate is not produced or whose name is not so listed. Any corporation or employer retaining any age and schooling certificate in violation of section 5 of this act shall be fined \$10. Every person authorized to sign the certificate prescribed by section 5 of this act who knowingly certifies to any materially false statement therein shall be fined not more than \$50.

SEC. 7. That inspectors authorized by this act and the truant officers of the District of Columbia may visit the factories, workshops, and mercantile establishments in the District of Columbia and ascertain whether any minors are employed therein contrary to the provisions of this act, and they shall report any cases of such illegal employment to the superintendent of public schools and the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia. Inspectors authorized by this act and the truant officers of the District of Columbia may require that the age and schooling certificates and lists provided for in this act of minors employed in such factories, workshops, or mercantile establishments shall be produced for their inspection.

SEC. 8. That no minor under 16 years of age shall be employed, permitted, or suffered to work in any manufacturing, mechanical, or mercantile establishment more than eight hours in any one day, or before the hour of 6 o'clock antemeridian, or after the hour of 7 o'clock postmeridian, and in no case shall the number of hours exceed forty-eight in a week.

SEC. 9. That every employer shall post in a conspicuous place in every room where such persons are employed a printed notice, stating the number of hours required of them on each day of the week, the hours of commencing and stopping work, and the hours when the time or times allowed for dinner or for other meals begin and end. The printed form of such notice shall be furnished by the inspectors authorized by this act and the truant officers of the District of Columbia, and the employment of any such person for a longer time in any day than that so stated shall be deemed a violation of this section.

SEC. 10. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint two inspectors to carry out the purposes of this act, at a compensation not exceeding \$1,200 each per annum.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask that the report of the committee also be read. It is short.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that that is not in order, except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request that the report of the committee shall be read? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary read the report, submitted by Mr. DOLLIVER May 3, 1906, as follows:

The Committee on Education and Labor, having had under consideration House bill 17838, report the same to the Senate with the recommendation that Senate bill 5665 be substituted therefor, with certain amendments, as follows:

In line 4, after the word "work," on page 1, insert the words "in the District of Columbia;" and after the word "message," on page 1, line 8, strike out the words "or in the Senate or House of Representatives" and insert "or selling newspapers;" also on page 2, after the word "work," in line 1, insert "in the District of Columbia."

With these amendments the committee recommends the substitution of the Senate bill, introduced by Mr. DUBOIS, for the bill passed by the House of Representatives and that the House bill so amended do pass.

These bills have a common object; they have been framed for the purpose of protecting children of immature years against the evils and temptations incident to the various occupations in which they are now engaged in the District of Columbia. At present the District is entirely without legal restrictions upon child labor, and the result is that hundreds of children under 16 years of age have been crowded into all sorts of occupations, many of them detrimental to the morals of the children and all of them inimical to our system of public education. It is found that there are 700 children in the District of Columbia under 16 years of age who work in the daytime and try to secure their education in the night schools. The records of the probation officer of the District indicate that in the last three months 300 children under 16 years of age who had been employed in various occupations in the city have passed under the jurisdiction of those appointed to take care of child criminals. In the judgment of the committee, it is a reproach to the government of the District of Columbia that its children of tender years should be left to the night schools for education and to the criminal courts for discipline and control.

Many of the occupations of children in the District of Columbia are in their nature such as to bring those who pursue them under influences which tend to destroy their moral character, as well as to deprive them of the opportunity of education and the advantages of home training.

It is the object of this law to prevent the employment of children under 14 years of age in factories, workshops, mercantile establishments, business offices, telegraph offices, restaurants, hotels, apartment houses, theaters, bowling alleys, messenger services, or in the sale of newspapers. As to these occupations, the prohibitions of this proposed statute are full and complete. This bill seeks to prevent altogether the employment of children under 14 in those occupations which undermine their strength or expose them to temptations and moral danger. The bill goes further, and seeks to prevent children under 16 years of age from engaging in the occupations before mentioned at such times as interfere with the school duties of such children; and as to children

under 16 years of age, night work is prohibited and the hours of labor regulated.

This bill is based upon a broad consideration of the social welfare of the community. It is modeled upon the State legislation which has proved most efficient and passed the scrutiny of the courts. It involves both a labor question and a problem of public morality. The intrusion of young children into breadwinning occupations is an injustice to the army of workers who are charged with the support of families. It is also an injustice to those whose taxes maintain the public school system. A community which expends the vast sum required for the maintenance of the public schools of Washington has a right to require that children of school age give their attention to the studies which fit them for a useful life. Night schools for children who ought to be at home in bed are a barbarism, unfit for the countenance of the capital of the United States.

More important, however, than the labor question and the school question involved in the employment of children for wages is the question of the moral ruin of hundreds and thousands of boys and girls who, under proper surroundings, might grow up into useful members of society. What effect upon the children themselves does this untimely bearing of the burdens of life have? Dr. Henry J. Harris, secretary of the citizens' child labor committee of the District of Columbia, stated before your committee that in the last three months 300 children less than 16 years of age have graduated in this city from the care of employers to the guardianship of the criminal courts. Such a condition of society is intolerable anywhere, and least of all in the District of Columbia, where Congress is the sole legislative authority.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there a second to the demand of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. HALE. What is the question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill, notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. HALE. I thought the Senate gave unanimous consent that it would proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the Calendar under Rule VIII. When that agreement has been made by the Senate it has never, as far as my knowledge goes, been departed from. That agreement cuts off such a motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is a matter, in the opinion of the Chair, for the Senate to determine upon the motion.

Mr. HALE. But what is the force of an agreement of the Senate that it shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is a matter to be addressed to the judgment of the Senate. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have no interest in this bill; but I give notice that hereafter when the Senate agrees unanimously to proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII for action upon unobjected cases, I shall insist upon the agreement. It is no use to make the agreement if any Senator has a right to move to proceed to the consideration of a bill when it is reached and objected to. That course would take away the entire scope and effect of the agreement that the Senate shall consider unobjected bills. We have done that for years, and in that way we make progress. Otherwise, when any bill is reached, if a Senator desires to make a motion to proceed to its consideration, he can make it, and he can do that unless the Senate by unanimous consent has agreed to take up only unobjected cases. I leave that to the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. If there was a unanimous-consent agreement that we should consider only unobjected cases, it seems to me very clear that no friend of the bill (and I am a very strong friend of the bill) would desire to press the motion at this time. The Calendar is a short one. It will be finished, I think, very soon, for there are many measures on it that will go over under objection, and then this motion can be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is an agreement to take up another bill at 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. I believe there is an agreement to take up another bill at 2 o'clock.

Mr. KEAN. It is the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. It is the unfinished business. In any event, this is hardly a practical question at this time. But I suggest to the Senator from Idaho that if there was unanimous consent given it would be better not to press the motion at this time, for we never wish to interfere with a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I of course do not desire to antagonize the friends of this bill, who are almost the entire Senate, but I wish to call attention to the fact that I desire to have the bill called up. It has been objected to and the passage of it prevented two or three times in the Senate. I have no desire to prevent other Senators from having bills to which there is no objection passed, and I will therefore withdraw my motion. I can renew it soon.

Mr. LODGE. Let me suggest to the Senator from Idaho

that he give notice now that on Thursday morning (as there are special orders for to-morrow and Wednesday), immediately after the routine morning business, he will move to take up this bill. I think we ought to do it. I think it is a bill that ought to be pressed to a vote. I suggest Thursday, or any day that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. I wish to say that I know nothing whatever about this bill. I did not even know what the bill was. I only invoked the unanimous agreement of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the attention of the Senator from Maine to a suggestion. I quite agree with him, of course, that wherever there is a unanimous-consent agreement it should be most scrupulously observed.

Under a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases, unless that unanimous consent goes further and specifies the limit of time within which the unanimous consent shall be in force, it can always be set aside by the motion of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of any other matter, thus terminating the unanimous-consent agreement. Otherwise, if the contention of the Senator is correct, when the Senate has once agreed by unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases on the Calendar, there will be no possibility during the remainder of that sitting to proceed to the consideration of any other measure.

It seems to me that a unanimous-consent agreement, without any time being specified during which the Senate will continue the consideration of unobjected cases, simply means that the Senate will continue in the consideration of unobjected cases until the Senate otherwise orders, and whenever the Senate, upon motion, proceeds to take up another bill it is equivalent to an order to terminate the unanimous-consent agreement. Of course it is not a practical question to-day, and I only state it in order that it may not be drawn into a precedent hereafter. I think the view which I present is the correct one.

Mr. HALE. On the contrary, it has always been the practice of the Senate, in order to get bills through to which there is no objection, to continue the operation of the unanimous-consent agreement until 2 o'clock. It can not go further than that, because then the regular business comes up. I have never known, in my experience here, when such an agreement has been made, that it did not run until 2 o'clock. After that, of course, other business comes up.

Mr. BACON. I simply desire to say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, that a request to proceed to the consideration of unobjected cases on the Calendar is very frequently made after 2 o'clock. So in the consideration of this as a parliamentary question that limitation, as suggested by the Senator, would not necessarily control.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 5133) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CHILD LABOR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. DUBOIS. I move to proceed to the consideration of House bill 17838.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho moves to proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee was agreed to as in Committee of the Whole and the bill reported to the Senate. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BRANDEGEE) to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. I simply wish to say that I have no opposition whatever to the bill, and the course that has been taken is precisely in accordance with the custom of the Senate. The Senator after 2 o'clock had a right undoubtedly to make his motion.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in anything that I may say in opposition to this bill I do not want to have it construed that I am opposed to the education of the children of this country.

Many boys, one of whom I happened to be in my youth, have had to make their living long before 16 years of age, and many a boy has had to support his aged mother and, perhaps, younger children. Many a boy has to receive an education at a night school.

Mr. President, as I understand the pending bill and its operation, you are going to compel boys to desist from labor. You are going to place them in a position where they will not be allowed to earn anything for the support of themselves or their families. You propose to say that they shall go to school.

I think if gentlemen will take the trouble to investigate they will find that at the present time the schools in this city are in no condition to take into the lower grades the boys and girls who are classed in this bill as being compelled to attend school. Many of the grades in many of the schools are so full now that children are not able to attend even half a day, and they are compelled to remain at home.

You may talk about the morals of the boys and girls under 16 being ruined. I ask the Senator from Idaho what possible legislation could be passed that would lead, I might say, to more direct immorality on the part of the girls and boys than being compelled by this law to remain idle and yet unable to attend school?

Mr. President, I wish to say that in my experience as an employer of labor it has been my privilege to educate four boys at night schools. The four boys educated at night schools—and they were orphans, with the exception, perhaps, of two, who had widowed mothers—started at very low wages, and I arranged for them to attend night schools. Out of these four boys I got three good ones—a pretty good average I think Senators will conclude.

One of them was for seven years manager of the factory that I am president of, until he died, a year ago. He was earning a salary of \$3,000 a year when he died. He educated his family and cared for his wife and had a comfortable home. The present manager of my factory was a German boy whom I sent to night school, who cared for three orphan sisters and one little brother, his father and mother being dead. He was only 11 years of age when he came to me, and to-day he is managing and caring for the factory with between 750 and 800 people in it. I am glad that the factory and the company that I represent are able to pay him a handsome salary. He lives in a three-story brick building, surrounded by his happy family, and it was due to his own exertions and his education in a night school that he is able to occupy the position he holds to-day.

If by legislation you had compelled that boy to remain idle on the streets, what would have been his condition? In all probability he would have been a loafer, unable to care for himself and his family.

I say, Mr. President, that this bill, ironclad as it is, compelling children to remain idle, would do them the greatest injustice this Senate could possibly inflict. What will become of our pages here in front of you? You could not employ a boy as a page. You will have to get pages over 16 years of age in the Senate Chamber. These boys are earning something for their mothers and fathers, perhaps, and at the same time they are acquiring an education in a way. You would debar them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to the fact that the bill is so amended as to be no longer applicable to the pages.

Mr. SCOTT. In what way, I ask the Senator? As I understand the bill, it says "under 16 years of age."

Mr. DOLLIVER. But it specifies the occupations.

Mr. SCOTT. And this is one that is omitted?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The original bill included the pages of the two Houses of Congress, but the committee on consideration felt that that was not a desirable provision of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask the Senator, why except these youths?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The advantages that are derived from our society are supposed to reimburse them.

Mr. SCOTT. What they may absorb in associating with us, I presume.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from West Virginia will permit me, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa what other classes of employment are grouped with the pages of the two Houses?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say to the Senator that the employments in which the labor of young children is prohibited are specifically mentioned in the first section of the bill, and the bill is applicable only to those prohibited employments.

They constitute a list including factories, workshops, mercantile establishments, stores, business offices, telegraph offices, restaurants, apartment houses, theaters, bowling alleys, the distribution or transmission of merchandise or messages, and the selling of newspapers.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, whether the next paragraph would not bar the pages of the Senate, where the bill says:

No such child shall be employed in any work performed for wages or other compensation, to whomsoever payable, during the hours when the public schools of the District of Columbia are in session.

Mr. SCOTT. It was my impression that they were barred.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Most of the pages, I think, are not eligible to attend the public schools here, as they have been brought here from their States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, where the provision is in the Senate amendment excluding the pages from the operation of the law?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The original bill gave a list of prohibited occupations, and among the prohibited occupations was employment in the Senate or the House of Representatives. The committee in redrafting that section omitted the prohibition as applied to the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. They are still included in the general terms of the bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think not.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me the suggestion made by the Senator from Wyoming is sound, that the general provisions of the bill would necessarily exclude these young boys from service here. I do not know whether that is wise or unwise, but I think that would be the operation of the law.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] called up this bill to-day. I was not prepared to have it taken up at this time, supposing it would go over under an objection; but being forced into the consideration of the bill, I have in a very feeble way given some of the reasons why I object to it.

Mr. President, there is a good deal of reform, moral preaching on honesty, and so forth, that appears to be abroad in the land. A gentleman by the name of Markham, writing a magazine article not long ago, said that he had visited the glasshouses and had seen children—boys and girls—with emaciated forms, with their eyes, as it were, protruding from their sockets, all due to overwork. He spoke of their little bodies being blistered by the hot furnaces, and a lot more of that kind of magazine stuff, for it is nothing but stuff.

I have been engaged in the manufacture of glass for thirty-five years and over, Mr. President, and if Mr. Markham had come to my factory to see the boys employed there he would have found an entirely different class from those he has described. He would have found an active, energetic set, ready to play leapfrog, catch, and hide and seek, and everything else; and in addition he would have found them singing songs in the factory, the latest production of some comic opera. He would not see anything like that which he described in his magazine article.

I am under the impression that he was not in a glass factory at all. If he was, he misrepresented the conditions prevailing there. The glasshouse boy of to-day becomes the glass manufacturer of to-morrow. There is scarcely a manufacturer of glass in the city of Pittsburg, or in the Ohio Valley, so far as my knowledge goes—and I know the majority of them—who did not commence to learn his trade, as it were, starting from what we call "warming-in boys," "sticking-up" and "carrying-in" boys, and so forth, which are familiar phrases to the glass manufacturer. They were boys who saved their money; boys who learned their trade well, and in the course of a few years became manufacturers.

As I stated a moment ago, to-day two-thirds of the men engaged in the manufacture of glass have come from the factory—boys who learned their trade while they were earning good wages, boys who earned from a dollar to a dollar and a half a day. We do not employ anybody in our factory under 14 years of age, because we now have a State-law which forbids it; but the description by this magazine writer of the boys employed in glass factories is absolutely absurd. Such absurdities mislead the public and cause much mischief.

I would be very sorry, Mr. President, if we should deprive

the boys and the girls of the District of Columbia of the opportunity of earning a livelihood and compel them to loaf on the streets, acquire bad habits, such as smoking cigarettes and the like, when it is impossible to get a majority of them into the public schools owing to their crowded condition. If gentlemen are so anxious to have this bill become a law, I ask them to wait until we can provide the facilities in our schools for taking care of the boys and girls who will be thrown idle upon the streets by its passage. I am not opposed, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, to the education of the youth of the land. But I am opposed to the bill as it now stands. I will gladly vote for it if it is amended as proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES]. With this amendment it would read, on page 7, line 3, after the word "age," "who is not wholly dependent upon his own labor or who is not the sole support of a disabled father, or a widowed mother, or of a younger brother or sisters."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] seems to me to prove too much. He argues that it would be a hardship to compel children to go to school because they might be used to support their families and themselves. If that is true, and that argument is sound, there ought to be no child-labor law on any statute book, and we should leave children unrestrained to earn their living and go without education.

The Senator describes to us boys to whom he has shown his generosity and kindness, speaks of their success, and attributes it to the night schools which they were enabled to attend—in other words, their education and not their ignorance was the ground of their success.

Finally, the Senator says the schools of Washington are insufficient to accommodate all the children of school age, and therefore we should allow a certain number of them to run about the streets or to earn money at all hours and seasons of the day.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. They would have to run about the streets if this bill became a law, because they could not be cared for in the schools.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I somewhat doubt the fact; but at all events I have no doubt of what our duty is in these premises.

There is nothing new, Mr. President, in these efforts to protect children. The laws limiting the hours of labor for women and children are of an old date in England, and go back to their factory acts passed in the forties and the fifties. Those factory acts or similar acts were brought forward in the early fifties in my State by my late colleague, Mr. Hoar. It is generally recognized in all civilized communities that there should be proper legislation protecting the children of the community, boys and girls who are growing up, and giving them that education on which, according to our American belief, the safety of the country and of the State rests.

Now, Mr. President, there is nothing new in this bill which it is proposed to apply to the District of Columbia. The provisions of this bill are taken from the laws of my own State and from the laws of New York and of Ohio very largely. Last year when the subject first came up in the Senate I took occasion to examine the laws of Maine and of Vermont, meaning to examine the laws of all the New England States. In those two States I found ample provision under their truant laws to make it certain that the children of those States should go to school when they were under 14 years of age, and should not be deprived of that great opportunity by being compelled to labor. I speak out of the experience of my own State, where we have very strong restrictive laws in regard to child labor. My State is a prosperous State.

Mr. FRYE. What is the limit in your State?

Mr. LODGE. Fourteen years.

Mr. FRYE. This, I think, is 16 years.

Mr. LODGE. No; I beg the Senator's pardon, it is 14 years in the Senate bill.

Mr. FRYE. I thought it was 16.

Mr. LODGE. No; 14 in the Senate bill. The same provision that is in the Massachusetts law is in this bill, if my memory serves me, that between the ages of 14 and 16 a child can only be allowed to work at a trade or in a factory if he has a certificate from the proper school authorities that he has attended school before the age of 14.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I wish to ask the Senator whether the law

of Massachusetts as it applies to factories is as broad as this proposed act?

Mr. LODGE. The law of Massachusetts is as broad as this proposed act. I have not made a side-by-side comparison, but I know it has the same provisions about child labor of all sorts, and as I have read this bill it seemed to me, speaking from memory, that it had been copied pretty closely from the provisions of the Massachusetts law.

Mr. CARMACK. Is this act broad enough to prevent children under 14 years of age being engaged in any employment during school sessions?

Mr. LODGE. During school sessions; and that is the Massachusetts law in substance. It is also the law of New York and of Ohio, from which, I think I am correct in saying, this bill is also taken.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is speaking of the Massachusetts law. I want to know if there are any exceptions in that law to any kind of employment of children under 14 years of age?

Mr. LODGE. Under the Massachusetts law?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I do not now recall any, but I could not answer a question of that sort without having the statute before me. I think I have a copy of the education law in my committee room.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should be glad to have information on that point. I want to know if the law of that State or of any other State prohibits children under a certain age from every kind of employment, under any kind of circumstances, and if so, how it has worked?

Mr. LODGE. It certainly prohibits them from the employments enumerated in the act or in the Senate amendment of the act.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; but it seems to me that there are others not mentioned here. The question is whether it applies to all labor under the second portion of the section of the bill now before us which prohibits them from being employed in any kind of labor.

Mr. LODGE. They are prohibited from all night work whatever. There is an enumeration made.

Mr. WARREN. The language of the amendment is:

No such child shall be employed in any work performed for wages or other compensation, to whomsoever payable, during the hours when the public schools of the District of Columbia are in session, nor before the hour of 6 o'clock in the morning or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; that is the law of Massachusetts, I know.

Mr. WARREN. That is, no child of 14 years of age shall be employed in any occupation or vocation whatever during school hours.

Mr. LODGE. During school hours.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; during school hours.

Mr. LODGE. The theory being that every child under 14 during those hours ought to be in the public schools.

When the Senator interrupted me I was saying that we have had these laws in Massachusetts for some time. There have been, as there always are, many efforts to evade these laws in the manufacturing towns.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether it is true that there is not seating capacity in the public schools of the District of Columbia for all the children of school age under the age of 14?

Mr. LODGE. That I do not know, but if such a condition as that exists it ought to be remedied. But that has nothing to do with the merits of this bill, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It seems to me that it has a good deal to do with the merits of the bill. I merely asked for information, because, if that condition exists, the children who can not be accommodated in the schools are thrown upon the streets if they can not be employed.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that we are proceeding in a vicious circle if we say if there are not sufficient schools we will not pass a law to prevent child labor.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator misunderstood me. I was not arguing in a circle. I was simply asking the Senator if he had information as to the condition of the schools in this particular.

Mr. LODGE. I have not got a report of the District schools, but I have here an abstract of the acts of Massachusetts, prepared for the use of the district police, who are called upon to enforce the child-labor laws.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment so that he may address himself to it in the course of his remarks? It is very short.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I have no objection.

Mr. BACON. It is to strike out one word and insert another.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that there is an amendment pending.

Mr. BACON. I ask, then, that my proposed amendment may be read, Mr. President, for information, to be offered at the proper time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 3, of section 1 of the amendment, before the word "years," it is proposed to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twelve;" so as to read:

That no child under 12 years of age shall be employed, etc.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts if it is contemplated by this act, if it be enacted into law, to cover the case of the boys who act as pages in the House of Representatives and Senate?

Mr. LODGE. That I do not know. I am not on the committee in charge of the bill. I was addressing myself to the general question of child labor. I see no reason, unless arrangements can be made for their education and they can get the necessary certificate, why they should not be included as well as boys engaged in any other labor; and if arrangements can be made, owing to the arrangement of our sessions, by which those boys get the quantity of education required, of course there is no reason why in the other time they should not be employed in such an occupation; but it seems to me that that is a perfectly unimportant detail, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. MALLORY. I think the language employed may be construed to apply to them, and it occurs to me that there may be some reason why it should not apply to them.

Mr. LODGE. I dare say there may be.

Now, Mr. President, returning to the question of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I have here an abstract of the child-labor laws of the State of Massachusetts, used, as I have said, by the district police, the State police who are required to enforce those laws. It is, I repeat, only an abstract. It reads:

No minor under 14 years of age may be employed at any time in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment.

During the hours when the public schools of the city or town in which a minor under the age of 14 years of age resides are not in session that minor may be employed in outdoor pursuits, as the selling of papers, magazines, etc., farm work, etc.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts think the measure which we are now considering, if it were enacted into law, would be much more drastic than the law of Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think so. It is only a difference in wording. The measure before us says children shall not be employed in certain occupations while school is in session. The Massachusetts law says that they may be employed in those occupations when the schools are not in session. That is the only difference.

Mr. CLAY. Under the provision of this bill, I desire to ask the Senator whether a child under 14 years of age can be employed in any business whatever? If I read it correctly, I understand that—

No child under 14 years of age shall be employed, permitted, or suffered to work in the District of Columbia in any factory, workshop, mercantile establishment, store, business office, telegraph office, restaurant, hotel, apartment house, theater, bowling alley, or in the distribution or transmission of merchandise or messages, or selling newspapers.

And further—

No such child shall be employed in any work performed for wages or other compensation, to whomsoever payable, during the hours when the public schools of the District of Columbia are in session, nor before the hour of 6 o'clock in the morning, or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the evening.

I will say to the Senator that I myself believe that we ought not to permit children to work in factories and machine shops, or to do any kind of work of that sort, until they arrive at 14 years of age; but when it comes to depriving a child out of school hours of selling papers and carrying messages, frequently

in many cases for the purpose of supporting a widowed mother, it becomes a most serious question.

Mr. LODGE. The section which the Senator from Georgia has just read is not happily framed.

Mr. CLAY. I think not.

Mr. LODGE. The first clause appears to make a general and absolute prohibition. The second clause—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Let me finish the sentence.

The second paragraph is a limited prohibition, which is the one which, as I understand it, conforms to all the State laws; that is, it provides that children shall not engage in any of these pursuits during school hours, but allows them to engage in all gainful pursuits not in factories or mines or mercantile establishments—all other out-of-door pursuits, particularly out in the air, when the schools are not in session. I think that is the intention of that section, which, as I have said, I think is not happily worded.

Mr. CLAY. If the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in his construction, then I agree with him, and would favor such legislation; but I think it would be difficult to construe in the way he suggests.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that as this first section of the Senate amendment reads it has the appearance, especially in the first paragraph, of excluding such children from all forms of labor at all times, whether the schools are in session or not. I am sure that is not the intention of the committee which framed the bill. It can, however, be very easily corrected, as I think it is very largely a mistake in punctuation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but along the line he was arguing I wish to ask him a question. The Senator is reading from the Massachusetts law some vocations in which children are permitted to engage outside of school hours, and they are the ones I want some information about. Are they occupations connected with farms, gardens, lawns, etc.?

Mr. LODGE. They are prohibited from engaging in the enumerated occupations in Massachusetts during school hours. It is only a difference in the way it is stated in that law and in this bill. In the bill it is stated that they shall not engage in those occupations during school hours, while in the Massachusetts law it is stated that they may engage in those occupations outside of school hours—exactly the same thing.

Mr. WARREN. If I heard the reading of the Senator correctly, in Massachusetts such boys may sell newspapers.

Mr. LODGE. Outside of school hours.

Mr. WARREN. And by this bill they can not.

Mr. LODGE. That is owing to the way the first section is framed, as I just tried to explain to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. WARREN. It is hardly a matter of punctuation, as the Senator has suggested. It is a matter of difference between the Massachusetts law and the pending bill.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that it is worded in such a way that in the first part of the section it is an absolute prohibition. The second half interposes a limited prohibition conforming to the State laws. I think that could be very easily arranged, for I am sure, from the conversation I have had with the Senator in charge of the bill, that the intention is to cover what is covered by the statutes of Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio.

Mr. DUBOIS. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the objection would not be met by striking out, in line 8 of section 1 of the amendment, the words "or selling newspapers," and, in the same line, striking out the word "such?"

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think, if the Senator will allow me, that that would reach the point that I understand the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has been making. It is not that he wants to except one specific occupation—

Mr. DUBOIS. I thought it was.

Mr. LODGE. But it is that all of those occupations, other than in factories and workshops, should be open to child labor when the schools are not in session.

Mr. WARREN. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. On that I agree with the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator of Massachusetts to the fact that the bill is in the Senate, and the question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. It might be well for the Secretary to read that amendment for the information of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose I am at perfect liberty to speak upon the general merits of the bill, but I should be glad to have the amendment read, for it may meet the precise point I am trying to make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, on page 7, line 8, after the word "newspapers," it is proposed to insert "except that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may make regulations for the issuance of licenses to minors between the ages of 12 and 14 years to sell newspapers: *Provided*, That no such licenses shall be issued except on the written consent of the superintendent of the public schools, and that such licenses so issued shall be revoked at any time on the demand of the said superintendent of the public schools."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the trouble with that amendment is that it relates specifically to one occupation. It seems to me that the provision which I have been led to read by questions as to the Massachusetts statutes meets what I think most Senators desire:

During the hours when the public schools of the city or town in which a minor under the age of 14 years of age resides are not in session that minor may be employed in outdoor pursuits, as the selling of papers, magazines, etc., farm work, etc.

I think that latitude ought to be allowed as it is in all of the States that have child-labor laws, and I think it is a reasonable one. The statute continues:

But minors so employed may not work before 6 o'clock in the morning or after 7 o'clock at night.

I think a little revision of the first section of the bill will meet what we all desire—that is, allow minors, outside of the hours when the schools are in session, to take part in perfectly healthful employments and exclude them altogether under the age of 14 years from the factory and the workshop.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize my inability to discuss this question with so able and learned a Senator as the Senator from Massachusetts, and I realize that it would perhaps be much better for me if there had been a child-labor law when I was a boy; but, if there had been, I fear I sometimes should have gone hungry to my books. I want to ask the Senator what he would have done with the young man in charge of my factory to-day, who told me, when he came to me for work years ago, that he had three sisters and a brother, and he was their only means of support. He was less than 12 years of age. Would the Senator have sent them all to the poorhouse, or what would he have done? I am just as much in favor of education as is the Senator from Massachusetts, and I am sorry that I have not a better one; but I do not want to put anything in the way of the boy who is by necessity compelled to earn a living for himself or for his parents or for his brothers and sisters, or to bar him from that privilege. I would rather see him grow up a good mechanic, a hard-working, honest man, than a loafer.

Mr. LODGE. Again, Mr. President, we have the same argument, and if that argument is sound there ought not to be any child-labor laws at all. I do not know how old the boy referred to was who subsequently became the manager of the Senator's factory.

Mr. SCOTT. He was less than 12 years of age.

Mr. LODGE. Under the laws of Massachusetts a boy of 16 may be employed regardless of the fact whether he is literate or illiterate, because the night schools are open to him, and he can attend those schools. I do not know, Mr. President, that we suffer any more in Massachusetts than do the people in any other State from the lack of facilities of child labor. The law is made sufficiently elastic to allow children of an age suitable for labor to work in a factory, and they are not excluded from healthful labor of other kinds; but children below 14 years are excluded from the mine and the factory, and I believe that is sound public policy.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. I have listened with great interest to the Senator, and I should like to ask him if he will not propose as a substitute for this proposed law the law of Massachusetts as it stands?

Mr. LODGE. I can embody that section.

Mr. MONEY. I should myself like, if the Senator will permit

me a moment further, to say that I want to vote for something of that sort. I do not understand this proposed law exactly, because I have not given it any attention, but at the same time I do not like the exclusion of boys, even below the age of 12 years, from work of any kind or character that is lawful and wholesome in order to aid in the family support.

Another thing. I totally object to any human being being required to get a license to do honest work. It is the privilege and the right of every man to work without a license.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. I ask the Senator now if he will not offer as an amendment the Massachusetts law, which I believe to be a good law, and think it would meet the case here.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator, of course, understands that we issue no license in Massachusetts to work.

Mr. MONEY. I understand that.

Mr. LODGE. It is simply a certificate that the minors between 14 and 16 years of age have had sufficient education to read and write. That is, that their education has not been wholly neglected.

Mr. MONEY. Then the Senator thinks that there ought not to be a license?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there ought to be a license. All we are trying to provide for is a certificate as to education.

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will permit me a word further, even in that case it is almost impossible for some boys selling newspapers to get any kind of education whatever, and as they are excluded from these little trades during school hours, the certificate ought to be quite sufficient. I have noticed boys 4 and 5 years old—and I have bought newspapers from them, although I did not want to read them—who are obliged to pursue a vocation by which they can make something for the support of the family.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I probably did not make myself clear. The certificate applies only to minors between the ages of 14 and 16.

Mr. MONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LODGE. It does not apply to any age below that.

Mr. MONEY. That would be very well.

Mr. LODGE. Only between 14 and 16, the theory of the State being that after 14 the minor can be employed, provided he has not been deprived of previous school education.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator one question, inasmuch as he has observed the working of the law in his own State, and that is this: What is done with cases of minors under 12 years of age who have no parents or anyone else to take care of them and who have no way of securing a living other than by their own labor? I assume there would not be very many of them, but certainly there must be some in the great cities. What provision is made for the education of those children who have no parents or anyone else who is interested enough to take care of them?

Mr. DUBOIS. May I answer the question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall be glad to have an answer from any source.

Mr. DUBOIS. So far as the question is local—and this bill is local, relating merely to the District of Columbia—the associated charities of the District of Columbia gladly take care of all cases where children have no means of support.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is a charitable institution.

Mr. DUBOIS. They came before the committee and showed that they had ample provision and were prepared to take care of all such cases as the Senator from North Dakota mentions.

Mr. McCUMBER. And send them to school?

Mr. DUBOIS. And send them to school.

Mr. McCUMBER. And not send them to a workshop?

Mr. DUBOIS. No.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the point.

Mr. LODGE. In Massachusetts, as the Senator asked me the question, I will say that children who are left orphans and who are entirely destitute of any relative or natural guardian are taken care of very largely at schools especially provided for that class of children by the State. Of course it is a limited number of children, and they can be taken care of by the State in that way. That is, they are clothed and fed and taken care of by the State or perhaps by the locality. But they are not a large number of children. I can only say that in practice there is no appearance in my State of any suffering being caused in any direction by the laws restricting the employment of child labor.

Mr. CARMACK. I wish to suggest an amendment to the first section.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. I will, although I shall be through in a moment; and, as I say, I am not in charge of the bill, and I can not say anything about the acceptance of amendments.

Mr. CARMACK. I merely wish to suggest an amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. HALE. Let me make a suggestion in respect to the order of business. The Senator in charge of the bill, a bill which I think the Senate generally is for upon principle, must see that there are so many suggestions made of amendments to be offered here that it will be almost impossible to perfect the bill at this time. I suggest to him, if this view has impressed him, that by some agreement the whole matter go over, or be recommitted to the committee, as the Senator chooses, so that we may have a bill reported either upon the basis of the Massachusetts statute or upon some other basis which recognizes all the difficulties that arise, and for which all of us in the end can vote. Let all the proposed amendments accompany the bill.

I make that suggestion to the Senator in charge of the bill, and, if we can agree upon that course now, there will be no need of further time being taken in the suggestion of amendments.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to say that I see no occasion to recommit the bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire to say that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], the chairman of the committee, I think is in charge of the bill. I introduced the bill, and it was referred to the committee of which the Senator from Iowa is the chairman. I myself would not think of consenting to the bill being recommitted. It seems to me that the objections which have been urged here have been answered by reference to the States where similar laws are in force. This is a carefully drawn bill. Almost all of the controverted points have been passed upon by the courts. Such a law is working satisfactorily in Illinois and Ohio and Massachusetts and other States.

Mr. CARMACK. I do not think the first section is in very good shape.

Mr. LODGE. I should be glad if I might finish what I have to say. I do not want to interrupt an agreement as to the bill, but I am very nearly concluded.

It seems to me that the first section can be put in form which will command the general assent of the Senate by meeting the views which I think we all have, and which I think we certainly all ought to have, that child labor ought to be stopped in the factory and the mines, and as to the other forms of child employment, they ought to be limited in such a way as not to interfere with the education of the child. That I think covers the whole ground. I do not believe it is good for the children of any country—I am speaking broadly, and you have to legislate for all and not for a few cases—to be placed in the factories or the mines or amidst machinery before the age of 14. It not only stunts their minds, but it must in the long run stunt their bodies. I have been through factories—clean and airy and healthful factories—where children were employed. But it is not a good thing for children to be so employed.

In almost all our States some limit is put upon the hours of employment for women. At the bottom of all this lies, to my mind, the great question of humane dealing with these children, to whom we are to confide and pass on the destinies of the country. I want them to have all the education the State can give them, and I want them also to have all the chance that is possible to develop soundly and well physically.

I have no doubt there are laws on the statute books of other States which are just as good as the laws of the State of Massachusetts, but I happen to be familiar with those laws. I believe that that is the sound way to treat the question—to exclude the child from the factory, the workshop, and the mines at any time of the day until he or she is 14 years of age; and after that, if they have a school certificate that they have been to school, then they can get employment. But up to that time I would exclude them absolutely. As to other employments out of doors, healthful employments in places which keep the children about and moving and out in the open air, I would give the same relaxation that the Massachusetts law gives. I would allow them to pursue those callings in the hours when the schools are not in session. I think it is the soundest policy,

not only economically, but in the interest of humanity and of the future of the voters and citizens of the United States to have legislation of that kind.

I ask, Mr. President, that this abstract of the Massachusetts law be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF CHIEF OF THE DISTRICT POLICE, STATE HOUSE,
Boston, August 16, 1906.

To whom it may concern:

The following paragraphs constitute a brief synopsis of the provisions of the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding the employment of minors. The purpose of this pamphlet is to state concisely and logically the restrictions under which minors may be employed, and references to chapters and sections of the statutes containing the provisions quoted are included, the laws themselves following on succeeding pages of this pamphlet.

No minor under 14 years of age may be employed at any time in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment. (Sec. 28 of chapter 106, Revised Laws, as amended by chapter 267 of the Acts of 1905.)

During the hours when the public schools of the city or town in which a minor under 14 years of age resides are not in session that minor may be employed in outdoor pursuits, as the selling of papers, magazines, etc., farm work, etc., but minors so employed may not work before 6 o'clock in the morning or after 7 o'clock at night. (Same reference as above.)

No minor between the ages of 14 and 16 years, to whom has not been granted a certificate by the school authorities of the town in which said minor resides, testifying to the fact that he or she is able to read and write the English language, may be employed in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment, except that on Saturdays minors between the ages of 14 and 16, who do not hold school certificates, may be employed between the hours of 6 a. m. and 7 p. m. in mercantile establishments. (Sec. 28, chapter 106, Revised Laws, and sec. 2, chapter 284, of the Acts of 1906.) This requirement is operative during the regular school vacation periods, as well as when school is in session.

The illegal employment of a minor under 16 years of age is punishable by a fine of not more than \$300 or six months' imprisonment, or both. If, after notification from a truant officer or inspector of factories and public buildings, the illegal employment of any such minor is continued, the party responsible may be punished by a fine of not less than \$20 nor more than \$100 or by imprisonment for not more than six months for each day said illegal employment is so continued. (Chapter 499 of the Acts of 1906.)

Employers must secure a school certificate from each minor between the ages of 14 and 16 in their employ, which certificates must be kept on file accessible to truant officers and inspectors of factories and public buildings. Employers must also keep on file a complete list of all such minors, posting a duplicate of that list in a conspicuous place near the main entrance of the building in which the children listed are employed. Employers must also keep on file a list of all minors whom they employ who can not read and write the English language, forwarding a duplicate of that list to the school authorities of the place in which their plants are located. (Sec. 29 of chapter 106, Revised Laws, and sec. 4 of chapter 499, Acts of 1906.)

Minors over 16 years of age may be employed regardless of their state of literacy during that portion of the year when a public evening school is not in session in the cities or towns in which they reside. When a public evening school is in session in the place of residence of a minor over 16 years of age that minor may not be employed in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment unless he or she has procured the regular school certificate testifying to his or her ability to read and write the English language, or a permit to work from the school department based upon a certificate signed by a registered practicing physician stating that said minor's health will not admit of attendance at day or evening school in connection with daily labor; or, failing to secure either of these certificates, said minor may yet be employed provided he or she furnishes to his or her employer each week while the evening school is in session a record proving regular attendance at either the day or evening schools of the place in which he or she resides. A record of school attendance showing absences excused by a school department official or teacher holding proper authority for justifiable cause may be accepted as proving regular attendance; but when the weekly record shows unexcused absences it becomes irregular, and the employer who allows the holder of that record to work violates the law. These provisions do not apply in cities and towns which do not maintain public evening schools.

The penalty for the violation of the requirements stated in the foregoing paragraph is a fine of \$100 or less for the employer and a fine of not more than \$20 for the parent, guardian, or custodian who permits the minor to be employed. (Chapter 106, Revised Laws, sec. 28, as amended by chapter 267 of the Acts of 1905, and sec. 35, as amended by chapter 183 of the Acts of 1902.)

Inspectors of factories and public buildings and truant officers are directed and empowered to strictly enforce the laws hereinbefore referred to. (Chapter 499 of the Acts of 1906.)

Respectfully,

JOSEPH E. SHAW,
Chief Massachusetts District Police.

[Chapter 267, Acts of 1905.]

AN ACT RELATIVE TO THE EMPLOYMENT AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF MINORS.

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 28 of chapter 106 of the Revised Laws is hereby amended by inserting after the word "years," in the first line, the words "and no child who is over 14 and under 16 years of age who does not have a certificate as required by the following four sections certifying to the child's ability to read at sight and to write legibly simple sentences in the English language;" by striking out the word "such" in the third line; by inserting after the word "child," in the third line, the words "under the age of 14 years;" and by striking out the word "nor" in the sixth line and inserting in place thereof the word "or;" so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 28. No child under the age of 14 years and no child who is over 14 and under 16 years of age who does not have a certificate as

required by the following four sections certifying to the child's ability to read at sight and to write legibly simple sentences in the English language shall be employed in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment. No child under the age of 14 years shall be employed at work performed for wages or other compensation, to whomsoever payable, during the hours when the public schools of the city or town in which he resides are in session, or be employed at work before 6 o'clock in the morning or after 7 o'clock in the evening."

SEC. 2. No certificate, as provided for by sections twenty-nine to thirty-two, inclusive, of chapter one hundred and six of the Revised Laws, shall be approved by any person for a minor under the age of sixteen years who intends to be employed in a factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment, unless such person is satisfied that such minor is able to read at sight and to write legibly simple sentences in the English language.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of January in the year nineteen hundred and six. Approved April 6, 1905.

[Chap. 284, Acts of 1906.]

SEC. 2. Minors to whom the said chapter two hundred and sixty-seven (Acts of 1905) applies shall be permitted to work on Saturdays between the hours of six in the morning and seven in the evening in mercantile establishments.

[Chap. 106, Revised Laws, secs. 29, 30, 31, 32.]

SEC. 29. No child under sixteen years of age shall be employed in a factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment unless his employer procures and keeps on file, accessible to the truant officers of the city or town, and to the district police and inspectors of factories and public buildings, an age and schooling certificate, and keeps two complete lists of all such minors employed therein—one on file and one conspicuously posted near the principal entrance of the building in which such children are employed, and also keeps on file and sends to the superintendent of schools, or, if there is no superintendent, to the school committee, a complete list of the names of all minors employed therein who can not read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language.

SEC. 30. An age and schooling certificate shall be approved only by the superintendent of schools or by a person authorized by him in writing, or, if there is no superintendent of schools, by a person authorized by the school committee; but no member of a school committee or person authorized as aforesaid shall approve such certificate for any minor then in or about to enter his own employment or the employment of a firm or corporation of which he is a member, officer, or employee. The person who approves the certificate may administer the oath provided for therein, but no fee shall be charged therefor.

SEC. 31. An age and schooling certificate shall not be approved unless satisfactory evidence is furnished by the last school census, the certificate of birth or baptism of such minor, the register of birth of such minor with a city or town clerk, or in some other manner, that such minor is of the age stated in the certificate.

SEC. 32. The age and schooling certificate of a minor under 16 years of age shall not be approved and signed until he presents to the person who is authorized to approve and sign it an employment ticket duly filled out and signed. A duplicate of each age and schooling certificate shall be filled out and shall be kept on file by the school committee. Any explanatory matter may, in the discretion of the school committee or superintendent of schools, be printed with such certificate. The employment ticket and the age and schooling certificate shall be separately printed and shall be filled out, signed, and held or surrendered, as indicated in the following forms:

[Employment ticket, Revised Laws, c. 106, sec. 32.]

When (name of minor) _____, height (feet and inches) _____, complexion (fair or dark), hair (color) _____, presents an age and schooling certificate duly signed I intend to employ (him or her).
(Signature of intending employer or agent.)
(Town or city and date.)

[Age and schooling certificate, Revised Laws, c. 106, sec. 32.]

This certifies that I am the (father, mother, guardian, or custodian) of (name of minor) _____, and that (he or she) was born at (name of city or town) _____, in the county (name of county, if known) _____, and State (or country) of _____, on the (day and year of birth) _____, and is now (number of years and months) _____ old.
(Signature of father, mother, guardian, or custodian.)
(City or town and date.)

Then personally appeared before me the above-named (name of person signing) _____, and made oath that the foregoing certificate by (him or her) signed is true to the best of (his or her) knowledge and belief. I hereby approve the foregoing certificate of (name of minor) _____, height (feet and inches) _____, complexion (fair or dark), hair (color) _____, having no sufficient reason to doubt that (he or she) is of the age therein certified. I hereby certify that (he or she) (can or can not) read at sight and (can or can not) write legibly simple sentences in the English language.

This certificate belongs to (name of minor in whose behalf it is drawn) _____, and is to be surrendered to (him or her) whenever (he or she) leaves the service of the corporation or employer holding the same; but if not claimed by said minor within thirty days from such time, it shall be returned to the superintendent of schools, or, if there is no superintendent of schools, to the school committee.

(Signature of person authorized to approve and sign, with official character or authority.)
(City or town and date.)

In the case of a minor who can not read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language the certificate shall continue as follows after the word "language:"

I hereby certify that (he or she) is regularly attending the (name) _____ public evening school. This certificate shall continue in force only so long as the regular attendance of said minor at the evening school is indorsed weekly by a teacher thereof.

Whoever, being authorized to sign the foregoing certificate, knowingly certifies to any materially false statement therein shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50.

[Chapter 106, Revised Laws, sec. 35, as amended by chapter 183 of the acts of 1902.]

SEC. 35. While a public evening school is maintained in the city or town in which any minor who is over 14 years of age and who does not have a certificate signed by the superintendent of schools, or by the school committee, or by some person acting under authority thereof, certifying to the minor's ability to read at sight and write legibly sim-

ple sentences in the English language resides, no person shall employ him, and no parent, guardian, or custodian shall permit him to be employed unless he is a regular attendant at such evening school or at a day school; but upon presentation by such minor of a certificate signed by a registered practicing physician and satisfactory to the superintendent of schools, or, if there is no such superintendent, to the school committee, showing that his physical condition would render such attendance in addition to daily labor prejudicial to his health, said superintendent or school committee shall issue a permit authorizing the employment of such minor for such period as said superintendent or school committee may determine. Said superintendent or school committee, or teachers acting under authority thereof, may excuse any absence from such evening school which arises from justifiable cause. Any minor not holding the certificate described above shall furnish to his employer a record of his school attendance each week while the evening school is in session, and when this record shows unexcused absences from the sessions his attendance shall be deemed irregular according to this act. Whoever employs a minor in violation of the provisions of this section shall forfeit not more than \$100 for each offense to the use of the evening schools of such city or town. A parent, guardian, or custodian who permits a minor under his control to be employed in violation of the provisions of this section shall forfeit not more than \$20 to the use of the evening schools of such city or town.

[Chapter 499, acts of 1906.]

AN ACT RELATIVE TO THE ILLEGAL EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS AND TO THE DUTIES OF TRUANT OFFICERS.

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Whoever employs a minor under the age of 16 years, and whoever procures or, having under his control a minor under such age, permits such minor to be employed in violation of the provisions of sections 28 or 29 of chapter 106 of the revised laws, as amended by chapter 267 of the acts of the year 1905, shall for each offense be punished by a fine of not more than \$300, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and whoever continues to employ a minor in violation of the provisions of either of said sections as so amended, after being notified thereof by a truant officer or by an inspector of factories and public buildings, shall for every day thereafter while such employment continues be punished by a fine of not less than twenty nor more than one hundred dollars, or by imprisonment for not more than six months.

SEC. 2. Inspectors of factories and public buildings shall visit all factories, workshops, and mercantile establishments within their respective districts, and ascertain whether any minors are employed therein contrary to the provisions of chapter 106 of the revised law and amendments thereof or additions thereto, or contrary to the provisions of this act, and shall enter complaint against whomever is found to have violated any of said provisions. Any inspector of factories and public buildings who knowingly and wilfully violates any provision of this section may be punished by a fine of not more than \$100.

SEC. 3. A truant officer may apprehend and take to school, without a warrant, any minor under the age of sixteen years who is employed in any factory, workshop, or mercantile establishment in violation of the provisions of sections twenty-eight or twenty-nine of chapter one hundred and six of the Revised Laws, and of any amendments thereof or additions thereto, and such truant officer shall forthwith report to the police, district, or municipal court, or trial justice within whose judicial district the illegal employment occurs, the evidence in his possession relating to the illegal employment of any child so apprehended, and shall make complaint against whomever the court or trial justice may direct. Any truant officer who knowingly and wilfully violates any provision of this section may be punished by a fine of not more than one hundred dollars for each offense.

SEC. 4. Inspectors of factories and public buildings, and truant officers may require that the age and schooling certificates and lists of minors who are employed in factories, workshops, or mercantile establishments shall be produced for their inspection. A failure to produce to an inspector of factories and public buildings or to a truant officer an age and schooling certificate or list required by law shall be prima facie evidence of the illegal employment of any person whose age and schooling certificate is not produced or whose name is not so listed. A corporation or other employer or any agent or officer thereof who retains an age and schooling certificate in violation of the provisions of said certificate shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one hundred dollars.

SEC. 5. Police, district, and municipal courts and trial justices shall have jurisdiction of offenses arising under the provisions of this act. A summons or warrant issued by any such court or justice may be served, at the discretion of the court or magistrate, by an inspector of factories and public buildings, or by a truant officer, or by any officer qualified to serve criminal process.

SEC. 6. Section thirty-three of chapter one hundred and six of the Revised Laws, and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith, are hereby repealed. [Approved June 20, 1906.]

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator from Massachusetts takes his seat, as he is quite familiar with this matter and has given it great thought, I wish to ask a question.

I find that an amendment has been offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] to insert on page 7, line 3, after the word "age," the words "who is not wholly dependent upon his own labor or who is not the sole support of a disabled father or a widowed mother or of a younger brother or sister;" so that it would read:

That no child under 14 years of age who is not wholly dependent upon his own labor or who is not the sole support of a disabled father or a widowed mother or of a younger brother or sister shall be employed, etc.

I should like to know, for I suppose the matter has had consideration—

Mr. LODGE. If any exception of that sort is going to be made, it must be very carefully guarded. We have found in practice in Massachusetts that there is a constant effort to evade the provisions of law and to put children into factories by parents who may not be disabled except by their own fault, and I have a great suspicion of exceptions of that kind.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. They ought to be very carefully guarded, and, if they are to be admitted for a moment, they ought to be in the control of some board in this District which will supervise them very carefully. Our law works perfectly well without such exceptions.

Mr. BACON. But what I want to know of the learned Senator is this: If, with the safeguards which he suggests, he recognizes that there may be cases where there ought to be such an exception—

Mr. LODGE. Everybody must recognize that there are such cases.

Mr. BACON. This bill does not make any such exception; and I would ask the Senator if he would not favor an amendment, properly guarded, which would make such an exception?

Mr. LODGE. Allow me to say that I am not in charge of this bill. It is not for me to say what amendments should be accepted or rejected. I have taken time which I ought not to have taken, led on by the debate which has arisen. The bill is in charge of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], the chairman of the committee, who is thoroughly familiar with the measure, and I do not feel that I have the right to pass upon amendments at all. I am prepared to support the Senator from Iowa in getting his bill through.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I do not wish the Senator from Massachusetts to understand me as asking him to accept an amendment, because I know the Senator is not in charge of the bill. But the Senator was discussing the subject, and being familiar with the matter generally I wished to direct his attention to a point which I thought very important.

While I am on the floor, without any disposition to occupy the time at length or to discuss the bill generally, I desire to suggest another thing, and this time I will suggest to the Senator who is in charge of the bill. There ought to be a distinction made between the prohibition of the employment of children in factories and other occupations deleterious to health and the employment of children in outdoor occupations which are contributory to health. It seems to me there is a very wide difference. While the subject generally must commend itself to the favorable consideration of Senators, at the same time there are very important details which ought to be most carefully looked into; and unless there is going to be a very careful and elaborate discussion of the question, in which there will be a full interchange of opinions and a careful arrangement of details, I should very much prefer the suggestion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that this matter have further consideration from the committee, in view of the suggestions which have been made and which will be made in the progress of this debate.

Mr. DOLLIVER obtained the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Before the Senator from Iowa starts on his argument—

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am not going to make an argument.

Mr. SCOTT. Will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. With the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, if we could bring about the adoption of such an amendment, I would certainly agree most heartily. Before the Senator from Iowa starts, I ask the Secretary to read a short article as a part of what I wish to say.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The Secretary read from the New York Sun of Saturday, December 8, 1906, as follows:

BLIND BILLY IS IN HARD LUCK—NO ONE NOW TO HELP HIM SELL HIS DAILY PAPERS—POLICE SWOOP DOWN ON HIS STAND AND CART AWAY THE TWO LITTLE GIRLS WHO HAD LONG LOOKED OUT FOR THE BUSINESS—FEARS HE WILL HAVE TO GO TO POORHOUSE.

Blind Billy was sad of heart last night. In the many years he has kept the little news stand at Mulberry and Bleeker streets, right in the shadow of police headquarters, he has heard the clanging of the patrol-wagon bells until the sound is to-day the most familiar thing that strikes Billy's ears. Year in and year out he has heard the patrol wagons go by.

But when the Mercer street police station patrol came to a stop right near Billy's stand last night something told the blind news vendor that trouble was at hand. He couldn't explain the feeling that came over him; he just knew that something was going to happen.

Two bluecoats sprang out of the patrol—bluecoats who have known Billy for nigh on to ten years—and although they hated to do it, they went up and told him he was violating the law in having girls under 16 years of age working for him. They told Billy they wouldn't arrest him, but they would have to take Annie Fagan, 10 years old, who has been his assistant for the past two years, and her sister Tina, 12 years, who helps during the evening rush hours.

Some citizen had complained to the police that the two girls who helped Billy to make a living were under age, and that it must be stopped. The police had no alternative; they had to stop it.

Annie, whom all the officials and attachés at police headquarters call "Merry Yom Kippur," thought the police were playing a joke on Billy, but she and Lena soon learned that the officers were in dead earnest. Yom Kip and Lena had to go to the station house.

Billy pleaded that he be arrested instead of the girls, but the police wouldn't hear of it—the children were the real offenders. And off the wagon rolled with the tiny prisoners, leaving the sightless Billy sad and alone. As best he could he locked the stand for the night and slowly picked his way through the street to his home at 324 Bowery. The little girls, after being arraigned in the Mercer street station, were sent to the rooms of the Children's Society for the night, and to-day will be arraigned before Justice Olmsted in the children's court.

Blind Billy was having a streak of bad luck when Merry Yom Kippur came into his life. Twice his stand was burned down by mischievous lads in the neighborhood, and it took all his savings to build new ones. Unscrupulous persons, taking advantage of the plight of the sightless vender, took papers without leaving the money on the stand, and Billy often found his stock depleted and no money to pay for the next day's wares. The youngsters, too, lurked near the stand, and when change was deposited by patrons they would snatch it up and run off.

One day two years ago Merry Yom Kippur was on her way home from school when she saw three boys steal money from the stand. The little girl's heart was touched. She knew Blind Billy was powerless to prevent such things and she walked up boldly and offered to help him. From that day on Yom's face had protruded from the window of the stand and thousands are familiar with her cry, "Uxtree! uxtree! Blind Billy keeps this stand, and this stand helps to keep Blind Billy."

With Yom on the job Billy prospered. There were no more thefts and no unscrupulous patron could go off without paying for his or her paper. And soon Billy was able to pay Merry Yom a stipend. The Fagins were poor and the \$2 a week which Billy has been able to pay has helped the Fagins. The father is sickly and unable to work most of the time, so very often Yom is the mainstay of the household. For weeks at a time they have lived in a tenement at 234 East Tenth street on Yom's earnings and tips alone. The father has been sick since cold weather set in, but Yom has kept the wolf from the door.

She and her sisters attend the Houston Street School, and early every morning and in the afternoon and evening Yom was at the stand crying her wares.

Blind Billy—Highley is his last name—is an old circus performer and for many years traveled with the G. F. Bailey and the Barnum & Bailey shows. At one time he was the best clown in the circus world. He was stricken blind about twelve years ago. He has supported his aged mother despite his affliction, and last night had saved up \$10.70 with which he planned to buy her a fine Christmas present.

While Billy is not inclined to be pessimistic, he said last night he feared that he and his mother will wind up in the poorhouse if the authorities take Merry Yom Kippur away from him.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, it is no purpose of mine to make any elaborate speech or to indulge in any elaborate discussion of this bill, although I have toward it a sort of parental relation in the sense that the committee of which I am chairman considered it and directed me to make a report in favor of it. And that circumstance makes me just a little sensitive when it is calmly suggested by brethren who have given their attention to the bill for the first time to-day that it ought to be redrafted by the committee in the interest of clear phraseology.

I do not think, either, that I ought to allow the suggestion to go unquestioned that the first section of the bill is hard to understand. It may be hard to approve, but it certainly is plain enough to understand. It prohibits in certain occupations named the labor of children under 14 years of age, and it allows in occupations not named the employment of such children out of school hours in the daytime.

Now, it is agreed by everybody that the labor of children in mines and in factories is bad and ought to be prevented. The Committee on Education and Labor listened with very great patience to some of the most intelligent men and women interested in philanthropic work in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, and this was drawn in strict accordance with their counsel and in conformity to the testimony which they bore.

It is true that, as a rule, the labor of children in factories and in mines is the worst of all possible child labor, but in the District of Columbia, to which this bill is applicable, there are places in which children labor where the injury to them is more fatal than it would be in any mine or in any factory. It was the testimony of these philanthropic women—and this, I may say, is largely, from the humane standpoint, a woman's question, a question which enlists of the interest of every mother in the United States—and their unanimous opinion that the labor of children in the District of Columbia in carrying messages and in selling newspapers at nighttime, and in restaurants and in theaters and in hotels and in bowling alleys was more detrimental not only to their intellectual, but to their moral, welfare than the labor of children in well-regulated factories or even in mines; and I am disposed to believe that these women who have studied this question profoundly told the exact truth.

Therefore there need be no misunderstanding among us. It is the object of this bill, applicable to the District of Columbia, where Congress has complete jurisdiction, to prevent the labor of children under 14 years of age in any of these prohibited occupations. As to occupations not specifically mentioned, their labor is also prohibited except out of school hours in the day-

time; and I venture to say that when the Congress of the United States fully discusses the child-labor question, as it will before very long, it will not adopt a standard very far from the prohibitions of section 1 of this proposed statute.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I understand the first sentence of section 1 to prohibit the employment at any hour of children under 14 years of age in certain enumerated occupations.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. CARMACK. Now, why does that include the selling of newspapers out of school hours?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It was the testimony of charitably disposed persons and of practical students of this question that the employment of little children on the streets selling newspapers, especially in the nighttime, was the most demoralizing of all the possible pursuits of these children. That was the testimony.

Mr. CARMACK. I can understand it as it relates to the nighttime, but within the hours prescribed in the second part of section 1—

Mr. DOLLIVER. It was their testimony that newspapers were put into the hands of children of very tender years in this town, and that they run a fearful risk of developing not into business men, but into beggars and criminals. Testimony was presented before our committee that of 700 children eligible to the night schools in this city, in a single quarter 300 of them, nearly one-half, passed through these occupations to the criminal courts and to the reform school of the District of Columbia. The showing was so tragical that not a member of the committee doubted the wisdom of preventing the employment of children of tender years in these occupations that bring them into contact with the rough and dangerous aspects of life upon the streets of great cities. It is a sad and humiliating thing to see these little ones dodging into saloons and into places of evil resort, engaged in what appears to the public to be a business, but is, in fact, a trap for their moral character and a reckless waste of their innocent lives.

Mr. CARMACK. I did not mean to express an objection of my own. I wanted to hear the Senator upon that point and to know if it had been carefully considered by the committee. I really think the Senator is right about it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I confess I was prejudiced against the prohibition of the sale of newspapers by children—interesting little fellows in all cities, they have seemed to me. But I have lately, going home from this Capitol, encountered child after child from 6 to 10 years of age who was mingling the business of selling newspapers with the degradation of street beggary; children who ought to grow up into the stature of good citizenship of the United States.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I understand the Senator to be now contending that the employment of these children in the selling of newspapers and kindred occupations is destructive of their moral character, a trap really for their destruction. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: If such is the fact, why is it that the bill does not entirely prohibit it rather than simply limit it? Why is it, if it is thus destructive, that the prohibition extends only to school hours, and that such employment is permitted without limit outside of school hours?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It distinctly extends to all hours. It is an absolute prohibition of children under 14 years of age selling newspapers.

Mr. BACON. It is not the first section that the Senator is on, then?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes. As to the occupations enumerated, the prohibition is without any qualification.

Mr. BACON. I did not so read it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with very much that the Senator from Iowa says, especially as to the contaminating influence of certain places upon boys of a tender age. But since the subject has been brought up by another Senator, I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if he is prepared to say that section 1, in its second portion, does not preclude the employment by the Senate during school hours of pages who are now with us? I assume, of course, that he will not contend that there are any contaminating influences surrounding the boys here. I want to know whether, under the bill as it now stands, these boys can

be employed for such work during school hours in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, as the bill came to the committee it contained an express prohibition of child labor in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. It was the opinion of the committee—and I will say that that opinion was shared by some of the most intelligent of the men and women who gave their attention to the subject before our committee—that the employment of these children in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States was a distinct advantage to them and not a detriment, and it was with the full consent, I think, of nearly all the good people who bore testimony before the committee that the employment of our pages here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives was left out of the prohibitions of the proposed law.

Mr. WARREN. Then, I ask the Senator again, does he not undertake positively to prohibit them?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say in answer that it was not the understanding of the committee that such a prohibition was made. But if there is any doubt about it, it will be perfectly easy in three words to save the pages of the Senate and House of Representatives from the operation of this proposed statute.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator does not answer the question. Does the bill prohibit their employment or not?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have said that there is an ambiguity in the matter which might enable a man to take either side of the question, and I am perfectly willing to relieve it by a plain amendment, because it was not the purpose of the committee to prevent the employment of children in the two Houses of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, just a word or two more. It is obvious that the Government of the United States is face to face with a universal discussion of the child-labor question. I do not know whether it has impressed you as it has me, but the whole outlook of our public opinion in the United States has undergone a noticeable change amounting to a revolution within the last few years. There are good people, and wise people, too, who believe that the most important question now pending at the bar of the American public opinion is the rescue of these children, in number amounting, it may be, to millions, from the heavy burdens and hardships of life in their tender years, that they may be left in the schoolhouses where they belong in the daytime and in their beds at night under the protection of their fathers and mothers.

Now, the District of Columbia is a favored spot on the map of this country. It constitutes a model for the States of the Union throughout the breadth of our national domain. It appears to me a strange negligence of Congress, which has the sole authority here, that not a line has been put upon the statute books of the United States in keeping with the philanthropic spirit of our States in respect to the employment of child labor in the District.

This proposed bill intends to correct that oversight, for it can hardly be more than a negligence and an oversight of Congress. In drawing the bill the committee has been careful to make what appears to it at least to be an approved statute upon this subject. We had recourse to the most enlightened legislation in England and in New England, and in Ohio, in New York, and in other States of the Union, and we have produced here a simple measure providing that in certain occupations prejudicial to children the labor of our boys and girls under 14 years of age shall be absolutely prohibited. In all other occupations their employment is prohibited except out of school hours in the daytime, and as to children more than 14 years of age and less than 16 a certificate is required from the school authorities.

I count the bill as important, first, because the welfare of nearly a thousand children in the District of Columbia is directly involved. I confess to you, Mr. President, that when it was stated before our committee in cold blood that practically half of the children employed in the District under 14 years of age in the course of a single year make their way through the police court to the reform school, it filled my heart with a good deal of sadness and anxiety for the future of the District of Columbia. That state of things ought to be corrected, and it ought to be done now. It is not a sound public policy to maintain a system of public schools as costly as we have here in the District of Columbia and then send our children to night schools. Children who work in the daytime, according to the testimony of all teachers, can not study at night in any proper sense of the word. The body is weary, the energies are overtaxed, and study at night schools is an addition to the burdens of these struggling young lives that ought to be avoided.

I have as much sympathy as anybody has with the gospel of hard work. I believe that the work which men do in this world is their salvation, physically, intellectually, and morally.

I shall not say a word here to disparage that. And yet there is in the good providence of God a little respite from labor given to the very young and to the very old. It is given to the young in order that they may mature their bodies and train their minds to the labors of life, and that little respite we ought not to deny to the children who live under the shadow of the Dome of the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee that reported the bill whether under the bill children up to the age of 14 are denied the right to work in the summer, in the long vacation?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, sir; they are not, except in certain enumerated occupations.

Mr. PROCTOR. Does not that enumeration cover practically everything?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Oh, no; the labor incident to agriculture is not included.

Mr. PROCTOR. Agriculture in the District of Columbia is not a matter of general occupation of the people, I believe—

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is ahead of mining.

Mr. PROCTOR. Except as far as mending fences may go. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that under the bill children below 14 years of age could not work at all at any time during the year in factories, workshops, mercantile establishments, stores, telegraph offices, restaurants, apartment houses, or in taking messages or selling papers? They could not work after school was out in those hours at all?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, sir; not under 14 years of age.

Mr. CLAY. Then, as I understand the Senator, there is intended to be a total prohibition of all children before arriving at the age of 14 as to those classifications which I have mentioned.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. CLAY. If I understand the Senator further, the next provision of the bill provides that as to all other occupations except those enumerated above they can work either in the vacation or after school hours, except before the hour of 6 o'clock in the morning or after the hour of 7 o'clock in the evening. The Senator intends to allow children under 14 years of age to work during the hours named in all occupations except those which are specified in the first part of the section?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. CLAY. And the Senator does not intend that they shall engage in any kind of work before 6 o'clock in the morning and after 7 o'clock in the evening?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is exactly the idea. Those who testified before our committee thought that the children ought to be in school at that age in the daytime and at home at night.

Now, Mr. President, just a word further.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I rise only to get information. I am not on the committee and I do not know what was presented to the committee. The Senator has told us what the testimony was before the committee as to the effect of the employment of children under 14 years of age in factories and workshops and in some other kinds of employment. But I should like to ask the Senator what the opinion was as to the employment in mercantile establishments, in stores, in business offices, in telegraph offices, and in places that are presumed to be places where there is a good, wholesome atmosphere. Was there any testimony to the effect that it was prejudicial to a child simply because under the age of 14 years of age to be employed in an office, for instance, as a messenger boy or as a boy to receive a card at the door?

Mr. DOLLIVER. There was. The most interesting part of the testimony that was taken by the committee was that which related to the total wreck of moral character of children in messenger-boy service in the United States.

Mr. FORAKER. I understand there was testimony as to some of these employments, and I can understand why there might be such testimony; but I am a little bit surprised to hear that kind of a statement made as to the character of employment I have called attention to.

According to my experience (and I have had occasion to be a pretty close observer of that), while it is bad to have a child employed in some of these occupations, there is only one thing worse, and that is absolute idleness. It seems to me as between a boy 13 years of age, for instance—and that would be under 14—being absolutely idle and being employed in a business office or in a store where there is a good, healthful atmosphere, I should think he would be better off if employed. But, of course, I do not know what the testimony was. I ask simply for information.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, as the report does not show what that testimony was, by whom it was offered on what authority it comes to us?

Mr. FORAKER. There is another question I should like to ask the Senator, if he will allow me further to interrupt him. Does the testimony show how many of those about whom this testimony was given, who made a failure of life, so to speak, and drifted into the criminal court, would have drifted there anyhow if they had not been employed? That is to say, was it the employment that led to it? I do not think that result would follow employment in a dry goods store as a cash boy, if there are still stores with cash boys. I believe that work is now done by machinery or some kind of apparatus that one hears when he goes into a store. But in any employment of that kind it never occurred to me that there was any danger to a boy being destroyed there—not half as much as if he were out in an alley playing marbles for keeps with some other boy.

Mr. PROCTOR. The chairman says that the testimony in regard to the ill effects of this labor of boys as messengers, etc., was given by Doctor Harris. I see from the report that Dr. Henry J. Harris is the secretary of the Citizens' Child-Labor Committee of the District of Columbia. He stated before the committee that in the last three months 300 children less than 16 years of age have graduated in this city from the care of employers to the guardianship of the criminal courts. He does not say how many children who had been attending school have graduated from schools to the criminal courts. I do not like to discredit his testimony, but I should like something a little more accurate from the record. Doctor Harris is evidently the secretary of an association, and to justify his employment he must make a report that will arouse and startle the sentiment of the community on this subject. I myself, like the Senator from Ohio, am a believer in the saving ordinance of work, and I know a great many boys who, I think, have been saved from harm by work, even at a comparatively early age. I believe many more are saved than are harmed, and in this city especially. It is one where there is a great official population, and there is employment for many boys as messengers, servants, etc. There are many families who I know would suffer seriously if this employment was cut off. If it is a question between the family starving and the child going to school, and at the same time having a chance to work outside in some decent employment, I should say give the child a chance to work.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask the Senator from Vermont a question before he takes his seat?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Vermont read from some report, which I have not had the fortune to see, as to how many children have graduated from employment into crime.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is at the end of the report.

Mr. FORAKER. I have not time now, but I will ask the Senator to look over it and see whether the report states how many have graduated from idleness into crime. I have always heard all my life that the danger to youth is idleness beyond almost anything else. I know there are employments that children should not be allowed to engage in. I would exclude factories, mines, and workshops. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] reminds me of the lines in the primer:

Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do.

That has been the experience of the whole world.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me a moment on another question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I dislike to disturb the meditations that are evidently arising in the mind of my honorable friend.

Mr. PROCTOR. For only a moment. The laws of the New England States have been referred to. These child-labor laws

fifty years ago in England and in New England in the early days of manufacturing were a necessary protection; but in my somewhat long life—and I believe it is longer than that of any one I see, though I yield a little to my friend from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]—I have never known any abuse of child labor. Public sentiment would correct it. I have never known an employer but who carefully guarded any violation of what was right. I suppose there is a child-labor law on the statute book of Vermont. I never knew it to be invoked. I have asked my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who is more familiar with the law, and he says the same thing. Public sentiment takes care of it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They obey it there.

Mr. PROCTOR. I believe they do very generally. I have known boys employed in mines, and boys under this age, but they were employed as water boys and errand boys. I have never known one to be employed in any capacity or at any time to seriously interfere with the reasonable chance for education or to injure him physically or morally. So far as the moral point is concerned, I believe it is in favor of giving the boy a chance to work rather than to keep him in idleness.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, this is a matter which everybody has got to form a conclusion of for himself. It can hardly be that a State like Vermont, full of good, sensible people, would enact child-labor laws unless there were abuses of child labor that required correction. Referring to the observations of the honored Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], while it is hardly a perfect defense for the committee, it is at least something in the nature of an explanation that the provision of this act in relation to the prohibition of the labor of children in the messenger service is copied from the statutes of Ohio. The arrangement worked well there and has the moral support of that Commonwealth.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, I am told that the provision is in the statutes of Ohio. I was not aware of that fact. But, Mr. President, that does not change my mind about it. A good many things get into the statutes, when there is discussion about them, that might be better left out. I do not know how it has worked in Ohio. I do not know what the provoking cause was for it. A committee, I suppose, reported on it to the Ohio legislature, and took some testimony, but I have never heard in all my life any complaint of harm coming to any boy who worked in a good, healthy atmosphere, such as stores and business houses and business offices usually are for boys to be employed in. My purpose in interrupting the Senator was only to ask what his information was that was given to the committee which induced them to put such a provision in the bill. I shall move to strike all that out at the proper time.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer, except to say that there is running through the literature of the child-labor agitation, both in England and America, a close facsimile of the arguments that have just been so ably submitted by the Senator from Vermont and by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. PILES. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, should this bill be enacted into law, if it would not prevent me, if I were practicing law in the District of Columbia, from employing my own son to work in my law office, carrying papers to and from the court, if I saw fit to send him there and educate him in that way?

Mr. DOLLIVER. In the school hours of the daytime you would have to let him go home.

Mr. PILES. Now, if the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I should like to say that I shall urge the amendment which I have proposed to this bill at the proper time.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What is that amendment?

Mr. PILES. It provides that this law shall not have application to a boy who is dependent upon his own labor for his support, or who is the sole dependent of a disabled father or of a widowed mother or of a younger sister or brother. It really should be a dependent sister or brother, as the case might be.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will put that in the bill I think there will be no opposition to it whatever.

Mr. WARREN. I rose to ask the Senator from Washington if he would not put in the word "dependent" in place of "younger," before the words "brother or sister?"

Mr. PILES. Yes; I will. I think it should be amended in that respect.

If I may be permitted just a moment, I believe if a boy desires to fight his own way in the world he should have that opportunity. I believe that the charities should look after those deserving of charity and who claim charity, but I believe a boy who says, "I seek no charity; I wish to make my own way in this world; I wish to support my aged or decrepit father or widowed mother or my dependent sister or brother," should have that opportunity in any healthful, moral employment; and, in my opinion, whenever the Government prevents a youth of that character from working in such employment it will have upon its statute books a law almost as detrimental to the citizenship of our country as the infamous system of working children in mines and factories.

Mr. President, under this bill no lawyer in this city would be permitted to employ his own son in his office, under the age of 14, to carry papers from his office to the court-house during the summer vacation, or to perform any light service in his office which would be, in the opinion of the father, of advantage for his son to perform, and which would have a tendency to educate his son along legal lines; neither could a merchant, during the vacation, employ his own son in his store, giving the boy such work as in the opinion of the father would be to his advantage and aid him in acquiring a thorough knowledge of the mercantile business.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With the permission of my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], I should like to ask my friend from Washington [Mr. PILES] a question.

Mr. PILES. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Would the Senator from Washington, who is a lawyer and a very excellent one, begin the education of his son in his law office in the practice of the law and in the science of the art of jurisprudence under 14 years of age?

Mr. PILES. As to whether I would or would not, Mr. President, is not the question. I feel, however, that I should have that right, and that my boy should have that privilege. Take, for instance, the case of a young boy but 13 years of age whose father is a successful merchant. That boy is idle in the summer. What objection can there be to his working in his father's business office, or in his father's store, under the direction of his father, who certainly has his best interests at heart?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just let us take up first the question of the law office.

Mr. PILES. Very well.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not ask whether the Senator thought he ought to have the right to put his boy under 14 years of age in his law office for the purpose of teaching him to be a lawyer; I asked him whether he thought, as a matter of wisdom, that any man who expected to make a lawyer out of his son would put him in a law office with that object in view when the boy was under 14 years of age.

Mr. PILES. I may say, for the information of my friend, that I knew a boy who went into his father's office when 13 years of age, and it did not injure him.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did it help him?

Mr. PILES. In my opinion it did.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, I will ask the Senator this question: Would a lawyer practicing in a city like Washington, for instance, and having probably not only means, but also wisdom and humanity, preserve his place at the bar if he did not have his boy in school during the school sessions and on vacation or at play when the sessions were not being held, up to the age of 14 years? I myself have had some slight acquaintance with lawyers, and I confess that I hardly think that any boy would be aided in the mastery of that greatest of sciences by beginning its study before 14 years of age.

Mr. PILES. I am not discussing the advisability of a boy commencing the study of the science of the law at the age of 14; but I do know from my own observation that some of the ablest lawyers of my acquaintance have not thought it improper to employ their sons in their offices in vacation, teaching them some of the routine work of the office, keeping their minds employed, and paying them for their services so as to encourage them in their work; nor did I ever hear of such a course injuriously affecting a lawyer's standing at the bar.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Boys under 14 years of age?

Mr. PILES. Under 14 years of age.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator advise that as a course of legal study?

Mr. PILES. I am not advising it; I have no objection to it, and I say that the right as it now exists should remain. I say it can not ordinarily be an injury to a boy, but it may be of great benefit to him.

I do not desire to trespass upon the time of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], but I wish to say that I am in favor of a law which will prevent children from becoming public messengers, from working in mines, factories, and all other places deleterious to physical and intellectual development; also in all places which have a tendency to degrade or reduce the moral tone of the children of the country. But I believe, Mr. President, that every boy should have the right to fight his way in the world and an opportunity to make a name for himself in all employments which are not harmful to his physical, mental, and moral development; and when a boy to that end desires to engage in any such employment, I do not think he should be restrained by law from so doing and forced to accept public charity in order to attend the public schools. You need not, Mr. President, worry about a boy with the spirit of success in him, for he will find both the way and the means to acquire an education which will be of real and lasting benefit to him and the country in which he lives.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not think it necessary for me to go into the matters just referred to by the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES], because I find nothing in the proposed legislation that would interfere with the parental authority of which he speaks. I am, of course, impressed by what he has said and by what is said by men of such practical wisdom in this world as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], and I probably would be entirely persuaded by what they say if I did not find the same arguments as to child labor scattered freely through the entire controversy from the beginning of the agitation more than half a century ago.

There could be no more serious weakening of this proposed law than to amend it in such a way as to allow people to permit their children to work when they are under the pressure of poverty and necessity. It does seem a little hard to let them starve when they might be saved by the labor of a child, but that same hardship appears in the enforcement of our health laws and in the enforcement of many of the schemes that society has adopted for its own preservation.

I was so impressed by the argument that families living in poverty might be saved from distress, at least, by the labor of little children that I asked the good people who appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor how stood that case in the District of Columbia, and those who were familiar with the work of the Board of Charities in this District, being before our committee, upon their authority and responsibility in connection with the associated charities of Washington, said that that association had investigated in this District every case in which a child could properly be said to be working for the support of anybody, and there publicly, before our committee, they undertook that that association would relieve all the distress occasioned by the discharge from the army of workers of these little children of the District of Columbia.

I suggest to those who are interested in this question, but are not interested particularly in a running discussion such as we have had here to-day, to take the hearings that were printed by the Committee on Education and Labor and examine that mass of testimony. I doubt very much whether any Senator, after fully investigating this matter, will refuse his support to the effort that this bill makes to put an end to conditions in this District which would be looked upon anywhere in the United States as discreditable and in this fortunate and happy community are little short of disgraceful.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to ask the Senator who has charge of the pending bill whether he will not yield to me to make a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will.

Mr. CULLOM. I want to say to the Senator that there are quite a number of Senators who desire to speak in regard to the question of child labor, and I do not see much prospect of being able to get this bill through this afternoon. I am myself for the bill, but I think I will insist upon making the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the bill may be made the unfinished business for 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is unfinished business which, by order of the Senate, will come up at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BATE.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

Mr. CARMACK. I simply wish to give notice that on Thursday, January 17, I shall ask the Senate to consider resolutions of respect to my late colleague, Senator Bate, of Tennessee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 11, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 10, 1906.

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frank F. Patterson, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs for the port of Camden, N. J., in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania. (Reappointment.)

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

William B. Ridgely, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Jose R. F. Savage, of Porto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Porto Rico, vice N. B. K. Pettingill, removed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Edson S. Bishop, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut. A reappointment, his term expiring December 10, 1906.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Thomas Ives Chatfield, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, in the place of Edward B. Thomas, who is to resign soon.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry arm—to be captain.

First Lieut. James D. Tilford, First Cavalry, from October 1, 1906, vice Stevens, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Chaplain with the rank of major.

Capt. Patrick J. Hart, chaplain, Artillery Corps, to be chaplain, with the rank of major, from December 5, 1906.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Civil Engineer Harry H. Rousseau, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 5th day of January, 1907.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Albert Mertz to be a captain in the Navy from the 2d day of November, 1906, vice Capt. William H. Emory, promoted.

Lieut. James F. Carter to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1906, vice Lieut. Commander John H. L. Holcombe, deceased.

Lieut. David Van H. Allen to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 10th day of October, 1906, vice Lieut. Commander Harold P. Norton, promoted.

Asst. Surg. Winfield S. Pugh to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1906, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

The following named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 12th day of October, 1906, upon the completion of three years' service in their present grade:

Elwin C. Taylor.

Franklin E. Campbell.

James E. Gill.

Isaac S. K. Reeves.

John H. Knapp, a citizen of Missouri, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 5th day of December, 1906 (subject to the physical examinations required by law), to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that day.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

The following named officers on the retired list of the Marine Corps to be advanced from the 29th day of June, 1906, to the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by them at the time of their retirement, as indicated, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved June 29, 1906:

Col. William S. Muse, United States Marine Corps, to be a brigadier-general on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Majs. Augustus S. Nicholson and Erastus R. Robinson, United

States Marine Corps, to be lieutenant-colonels on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Cpts. Frederick H. Corrie, Frank D. Webster, and Archibald S. Taylor, United States Marine Corps, to be majors on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Second Lieut. Edward R. Miller, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 10, 1906.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Loyal E. Knappen, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the western district of Michigan.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Philip S. Malcolm, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for the district of Willamette, in the State of Oregon.

MEMBER OF PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

W. Morgan Shuster, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Philippine Commission and to be secretary of public instruction in the Philippine Islands, provided for in the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes."

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. William Vans Edmondson Jacobs to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from November 4, 1906.

First Lieut. James Mahool Moore to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 1, 1906.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

General officers.

Maj. Gen. Arthur MacArthur to be Lieutenant-General from September 15, 1906.

Brig. Gen. Jesse M. Lee to be major-general from September 18, 1906.

Capt. John J. Pershing, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general from September 20, 1906.

Inspector-General's Department.

Col. Ernest A. Garlington, inspector-general, to be Inspector-General, with rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning October 1, 1906, with rank from that date.

Pay Department.

Col. Culver C. Sniffen, Assistant Paymaster-General, to be Paymaster-General, with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning September 11, 1906, with rank from that date.

Col. Arthur Murray, Artillery Corps, to be Chief of Artillery, with the rank of brigadier-general from October 1, 1906.

Medical Department.

Brig. Gen. Robert M. O'Reilly, surgeon-general, to be Surgeon-General with the rank of brigadier-general for the period of four years beginning September 7, 1906, with rank from September 7, 1902.

Cavalry Arm.

Second Lieut. William W. West, jr., Twenty-fifth Infantry, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, August 28, 1906, with rank from June 13, 1905.

Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Edward J. Cullen, Seventeenth Infantry, from the infantry arm to the artillery corps, September 12, 1906, with rank from June 13, 1906.

Promotion in Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry.

Second Lieut. Eduardo Iriarte, Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 7, 1906.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Quartermaster's Department.

Capt. Joseph T. Crabbs, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from June 30, 1906.

Medical Department.

Capt. Edward L. Munson, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from July 11, 1906.

Pay Department.

Lieut. Col. William H. Comegys, deputy paymaster-general, to be assistant paymaster-general with the rank of colonel from September 13, 1906.

Maj. Elijah W. Halford, paymaster, to be deputy paymaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from September 13, 1906.

Capt. Eugene Coffin, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from August 6, 1906.

Capt. John R. Lynch, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from September 13, 1906.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Ernest H. Ruffner, Corps of Engineers, from September 9, 1906.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Frederic V. Abbot, Corps of Engineers, from September 9, 1906.

Maj. Thomas L. Casey, Corps of Engineers, from September 26, 1906.

To be majors.

Capt. William W. Harts, Corps of Engineers, from September 9, 1906.

Capt. Edgar Jadwin, Corps of Engineers, from September 26, 1906.

To be captains.

First Lieut. John R. Slattery, Corps of Engineers, from June 27, 1906.

First Lieut. Curtis W. Otwell, Corps of Engineers, from September 9, 1906.

First Lieut. Hubert L. Wigmore, Corps of Engineers (subject to examination required by law), from September 17, 1906.

First Lieut. Alfred B. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, from September 26, 1906.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Joseph H. Earle, Corps of Engineers, from June 27, 1906.

Second Lieut. Thomas M. Robins, Corps of Engineers, from September 9, 1906.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be majors.

Capt. George W. Burr, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Odus C. Horney, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. George Montgomery, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Tracy C. Dickson, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Lawson M. Fuller, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Charles C. Jamieson, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. John W. Joyes, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Jay E. Hoffer, Ordnance Department, from June 25, 1906.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Walter S. Schuyler, Third Cavalry, from August 20, 1906.

Lieut. Col. Henry P. Kingsbury, Eighth Cavalry, from August 31, 1906.

Lieut. Col. Frank West, Seventh Cavalry, from October 1, 1906.

Lieut. Col. George F. Chase, Twelfth Cavalry, from October 2, 1906.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. George K. Hunter, Sixth Cavalry, from June 30, 1906.

Maj. Charles M. O'Connor, Fourteenth Cavalry, from August 20, 1906.

Maj. Wilber E. Wilder, Fifteenth Cavalry, from September 13, 1906.

Maj. John F. Guilfoyle, unassigned, from October 1, 1906.

Maj. Charles H. Watts, Fifth Cavalry, from October 1, 1906.

Maj. Frank A. Edwards, Fourth Cavalry, from October 2, 1906.

To be majors.

Capt. J. F. Reynolds Landis, First Cavalry, from June 30, 1906.

Capt. Parker W. West, Fifteenth Cavalry, from August 20, 1906.

Capt. Frederick S. Foltz, Second Cavalry, from September 13, 1906.

Capt. John H. Gardner, Second Cavalry, from September 13, 1906.

Capt. Charles J. Stevens, from October 1, 1906.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Clark D. Dudley, Fourteenth Cavalry, from June 30, 1906.

First Lieut. Edwin A. Hickman, First Cavalry, from July 18, 1906.

First Lieut. Warren W. Whitside, Fifteenth Cavalry, from August 20, 1906.

First Lieut. Samuel A. Purviance, Fourth Cavalry, from September 13, 1906.

First Lieut. Frederick C. Johnson, Second Cavalry, from September 13, 1906.

First Lieut. Guy Cushman, Eleventh Cavalry, from September 20, 1906.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William N. Haskell, Ninth Cavalry, from April 26, 1906.

Second Lieut. Henry A. Meyer, jr., Thirteenth Cavalry, from June 30, 1906.

Second Lieut. Frank Keller, Eighth Cavalry, from July 18, 1906.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Henry L. Harris, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Lieut. Col. Arthur Murray, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Lieut. Col. John A. Lundeen, Artillery Corps, from October 2, 1906.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. George L. Anderson, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Maj. Lotus Niles, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Maj. William H. Coffin, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

To be majors.

Capt. Thomas Ridgway, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

Capt. John W. Ruckman, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

Capt. William P. Stone, Artillery Corps, from September 30, 1906.

Capt. Ira A. Haynes, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Capt. Willoughby Walke, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Capt. William F. Hancock, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

Capt. John Conklin, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Harry W. Newton, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

First Lieut. Allen D. Raymond, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

First Lieut. James R. Pourie, Artillery Corps, from September 30, 1906.

First Lieut. John L. Hughes, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

First Lieut. John W. C. Abbott, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

First Lieut. Harry T. Matthews, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

First Lieut. Harry C. Barnes, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

First Lieut. Stephen H. Mould, Artillery Corps, from October 16, 1906.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Burt, Artillery Corps, from June 9, 1906.

Second Lieut. William N. Michel, Artillery Corps, from June 22, 1906.

Second Lieut. Howard S. Miller, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

Second Lieut. William H. Menges, Artillery Corps, from June 30, 1906.

Second Lieut. Arthur L. Keesling, Artillery Corps, from July 1, 1906.

Second Lieut. Francis J. Behr, Artillery Corps, from September 28, 1906.

Second Lieut. Thomas A. Jones, Artillery Corps, from September 30, 1906.

Second Lieut. John R. Musgrave, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Second Lieut. Hartman L. Butler, Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1906.

Second Lieut. William H. Peek, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

Second Lieut. James E. Wilson, Artillery Corps, from October 3, 1906.

Second Lieut. Thomas W. Hollyday, Artillery Corps, from October 16, 1906.

Second Lieut. Albert L. Rhoades, Artillery Corps, from October 19, 1906.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Herbert S. Foster (since retired from active service), Twelfth Infantry, from June 25, 1906.

Lieut. Col. John C. Dent, Twenty-fourth Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

Lieut. Col. George K. McGunnegle, Seventeenth Infantry, from July 3, 1906.

Lieut. Col. Edgar B. Robertson, Ninth Infantry, from October 6, 1906.

Lieut. Col. Henry A. Greene, First Infantry, from October 20, 1906.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Francis H. French, unassigned, from June 25, 1906.

Maj. Ammon A. Augur, Twenty-ninth Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

Maj. Charles McClure, Fourteenth Infantry, from July 3, 1906.

Maj. Silas A. Wolf, Nineteenth Infantry, from July 13, 1906.

Maj. Charles G. Starr (since retired from active service), unassigned, from September 4, 1906.

Maj. William C. Buttler, Twenty-ninth Infantry, from October 6, 1906.

Maj. James S. Rogers, Fourth Infantry, from October 20, 1906.

Maj. George S. Young, Eighteenth Infantry, from October 30, 1906.

Maj. Robert L. Bullard, Twenty-eighth Infantry, from October 31, 1906.

To be majors.

Capt. Elmore F. Taggart, Eighth Infantry, from June 25, 1906.

Capt. Samson L. Faison, unassigned, from June 30, 1906.

Capt. Alfred Hasbrouck, Fourteenth Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

Capt. Jacob F. Kreps, Twenty-second Infantry, from July 3, 1906.

Capt. Henry C. Cabell, Fourteenth Infantry, from July 13, 1906.

Capt. Frederick Perkins, Eighth Infantry, from August 7, 1906.

Capt. William P. Burnham, Ninth Infantry, from August 20, 1906.

Capt. James M. Arrasmith, Eighteenth Infantry, from September 11, 1906.

Capt. William H. Johnston, Sixteenth Infantry, from October 6, 1906.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Frederick S. L. Price, Fourteenth Infantry, from June 25, 1906.

First Lieut. Clifton C. Kinney, Ninth Infantry, from June 30, 1906.

First Lieut. Woodson Hocker, Eleventh Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

First Lieut. James S. Young, jr., Tenth infantry, from July 2, 1906.

First Lieut. William M. Parker, Eleventh Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

First Lieut. Charles B. Clark, Fifth Infantry, from July 3, 1906.

First Lieut. Irvin L. Hunt, Nineteenth Infantry, from July 7, 1906.

First Lieut. George S. Simonds, Twenty-second Infantry, from July 13, 1906.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. George W. Sager, Nineteenth Infantry, from June 5, 1906.

Second Lieut. Thorne Strayer, Twenty-sixth Infantry, from June 6, 1906.

Second Lieut. Francis B. Eastman, Tenth Infantry, from June 15, 1906.

Second Lieut. Kneeland S. Snow, Ninth Infantry, from June 30, 1906.

Second Lieut. Bates Tucker, Fourteenth Infantry, from July 2, 1906.

RETIRED LIST OF ARMY.

With the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Louis V. Caziarc, retired, from October 1, 1906.

Col. Oliver E. Wood, retired, from October 1, 1906.

Col. William M. Wallace, retired, from October 2, 1906.

Col. Charles H. Noble, retired, from October 20, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

A. Zilpah Hopkins to be postmaster at Ketchikan, Alaska.

ARKANSAS.

John L. Smith to be postmaster at Van Buren, in the county of Crawford and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

Frank E. Cushing to be postmaster at Red Bluff, in the county of Tehama and State of California.

Lizzie McGann to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California.

Henry W. Nash to be postmaster at Stirling City, in the county of Butte and State of California.

Benjamin F. Newby to be postmaster at Dixon, in the county of Solano and State of California.

John F. Rudolph to be postmaster at Lompoc, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California.

COLORADO.

John A. Bunker to be postmaster at Paonia, in the county of Delta and State of Colorado.

Emma C. Burke to be postmaster at Sterling, in the county of Logan and State of Colorado.

IDAHO.

John H. Bruce to be postmaster at Weiser, in the county of Washington and State of Idaho.

ILLINOIS.

Edward I. Boies to be postmaster at Sycamore, in the county of Dekalb and State of Illinois.

William P. Dickie to be postmaster at Bunker Hill, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

Luranah Haworth to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Vermillion and State of Illinois.

Peter E. Low to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Woodford and State of Illinois.

Milton M. Rodenberger to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

William H. Whitehouse to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Will H. Conway to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana.

Roy E. Turner to be postmaster at Dana, in the county of Vermillion and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Lura M. Allen to be postmaster at Okemah, District 9, Indian Territory.

Joseph H. Butler to be postmaster at Vinita, in District 2, Indian Territory.

KANSAS.

George W. Benedick to be postmaster at Plainville, in the county of Rooks and State of Kansas.

John A. Davidson to be postmaster at White City, in the county of Morris and State of Kansas.

MICHIGAN.

Robert H. Barnum to be postmaster at Iron River, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Manley S. Elliott to be postmaster at Paynesville, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

Clinton D. Grinols to be postmaster at St. Cloud, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

Fred Herring to be postmaster at Hawley, in the county of Clay and State of Minnesota.

Mary H. James to be postmaster at Virginia, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

George N. Gromer to be postmaster at Pattonsburg, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri.

MONTANA.

Edward H. Cooney to be postmaster at Great Falls, in the county of Cascade and State of Montana.

NEW JERSEY.

John E. Morton to be postmaster at Palmyra, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

Pryce W. Bailey to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Barnabas A. Baber to be postmaster at Shelby, in the county of Cleveland and State of North Carolina.

OHIO.

Samuel N. Patton to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Highland and State of Ohio.

William D. Powley to be postmaster at Monroeville, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

Charles J. Thompson to be postmaster at Defiance, in the county of Defiance and State of Ohio.

TENNESSEE.

Frank W. Galbraith to be postmaster at Jefferson City, in the county of Jefferson and State of Tennessee.

N. J. Tallent to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Rhea and State of Tennessee.

William J. Wells to be postmaster at Loudon, in the county of Loudon and State of Tennessee.

WASHINGTON.

Hiram Hammer to be postmaster at Sedro Woolley, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington.

Charles P. Kimball to be postmaster at Bremerton, in the county of Kitsap and State of Washington.

Daniel C. Pearson to be postmaster at Stanwood, in the county of Snohomish and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, December 10, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 7, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER appointed Representative BRADLEY of New York, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DRESSER was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under the rules this is District day. I understand that there is an appropriation bill before the House which it especially desires to act upon, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call up business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia next Monday instead of to-day.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand next Monday will be suspension day. I do not think that a special order ought to be made for that day.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest next Tuesday.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that I should be present on District day, and I shall be obliged to be absent on Tuesday. I shall therefore object.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will change my request and ask that it be in order to call up business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia on the day following the conclusion of the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title and the following resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below: Senate concurrent resolution 25:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3454) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to William Wilson."

to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

An act (S. 6261) to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill (H. R. 9754) to provide for the classification of the salaries of clerks employed in post-offices of the first and second classes.

The request was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21574) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, and pending that I desire to ask the other side of the House if we can agree upon any time for general debate?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that debate can run on a while until we can ascertain later in the day how much time we want on either side.

Mr. BINGHAM. Could we not agree on two days for general debate?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am inclined to think that we do not want as much as two days.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very well; then at present we will allow the debate to run without limit.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] in charge of the bill will necessarily be absent to-morrow, and if general debate should close before that time, it ought to be understood that the bill should not be taken up under the five-minute rule Wednesday.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will agree to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that if general debate should close before the adjournment on Tuesday, the bill shall not be called for reading under the five-minute rule until Wednesday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the question of division of time has been agreed upon. I do not know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Georgia desire to make any agreement about it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time for general debate be equally divided between the two sides of the House, the time to be controlled on the other side by the gentleman from Georgia and on this side by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or such Members, as they may designate in their absence. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion of Mr. BINGHAM was then agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. HERBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, my remarks in presenting this bill for the consideration of your committee will be most limited so far as the details of the bill are concerned. The current law, which this House made at its first session, was so fully and ably discussed that this body—the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—is perhaps as familiar with it as any explanation I could make, and I shall advert to it only in this respect, that the current law was presented to the House on March 9 and to the Committee of the Whole House on March 13, and passed the House on March 24. If my recollection of the reading be correct, there was but one important change in the bill as presented by the committee. The bill, therefore, as it came from the committee—that is, the complete examination covering some seven hundred and fifty-odd pages of testimony, consuming a number of days in the hearing of that testimony—was so thorough and complete that upon the presentation of the details the House accepted the action of your committee. That law has operated during this fiscal year and has resulted in much good administration in the legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments of the Government.

This bill, as has been common for some ten years past, comes from your committee after having assembled—the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—on the 26th day of November last. Beginning with that date and continuing from day to day the deliberations of the committee, they will be found to occupy some 300 pages of printed testimony, and they are respectfully submitted to the House in detail. Your Book of Estimates was critically gone through, and I think a wise conclusion reached. The committee, sitting, as I have stated, before the usual assembling of the House, followed a practice which has been common for the past ten years and more. Therefore there is nothing unusual in presenting this legislation to the House at this early date. The rulings of the Chair with reference to the many points of order, together with the report from the Committee on Rules which passed the House by a vote of 169 yeas to 109 nays, had been adopted and followed, and the bill passed upon under those rulings in their qualifications may present the same propositions in this House. This bill is built upon the same lines as the bill that you acted upon in the first session. It is open to the same character of points of order, and I am free to say that, so far as I am concerned, the ruling of the Chair was clear, and may be quoted in this debate at some period during the details of the bill. There will be no time lost in taking exception to the ruling, because it is a clear ruling, so far as this bill is concerned. We have endeavored in presenting the legislation that is before you to make the bill economic in relation to the current-year appropriations, as well as careful with reference to the estimates submitted by the several Departments of the Government.

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on pages 9-95 and 140-151 of the Book of Estimates for 1908, and aggregate \$31,215,525.80, of which amount there is recommended in the bill \$30,529,853.80, a reduction of \$685,652 under said estimates. Your committee are of the opinion that in submitting that conclusion we have been neither neglectful of the requirements of the several Departments and their needs, nor have we been forgetful of the merits of some limited number of the subordinate force who are recommended for increase in salary. The appropriations for the same purposes for the current fiscal year, including \$448,066 carried in the sundry civil, deficiency, and other acts, aggregate \$30,168,485.30, being \$361,368.50 less than is recommended in the accompanying bill for the service of the fiscal year 1908. The whole number of salaries specifically provided for in the bill is 14,727, or 202 less than the number estimated for and 29 more than the number provided for in the law for the current year.

I shall not at this time select from the report such parts of the proposed changes as I think may commend themselves perhaps to the criticism or approval of the committee, but at a later stage, when we reach the paragraphs of the bill, I may do so.

The Government Printing Office, acting under the authority of the current law, has submitted to us in detail such force as can hereafter be placed in this bill at a fixed compensation. The Library of Congress we have left almost as it is in the current law, and in that connection at this time permit me to suggest that the great part of this bill is current law. As to the Department of State, I shall advert to it in my remarks by quoting some of the statements of the Secretary. We have been generous to that Department in this bill, as has been the current law. In the Treasury Department, with its upward of 3,000 subordinates, there are a limited number of changes. The same may be said of the War Department. There is a limited changes in respect to the office of public buildings and grounds, and there are some changes in the matter of the State, War, and Navy building, where also there has been a reduction of force—a change in the heating apparatus of the building. The Navy Department is most limited in the changes we have made, as is also the Department of the Interior, one of the great Departments of the Government. I may say the same of the Post-Office Department, with its great growth, and of the Department of Justice, as well as the Department of Commerce and Labor, and also the Court of Claims.

I will place in my remarks for the information of the House and its convenience a full report that goes into detail of the several paragraphs of increases or changes in the bill. Gentlemen will find on page 23 of the bill now before the House the first limitation, or submission, as it may be called, of new law:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

The Congress has been now in session a week, and the question of simplified spelling has been one of general discussion. I believe the list embraces 300 words. It is not my purpose to enter into a debate which will undoubtedly be entered into

by gentlemen of the House, but the matter came before your subcommittee on Appropriations naturally. The Book of Estimates contained the simplified spelling. Throughout all the items submitted in the book were appropriations recommended in that way. The print coming from the Public Printer came to us with the simplified spelling. In that way it came to our attention. The matter was discussed in committee. The Public Printer was called, together with his proof reader and his chief of printing. We heard them, and I shall make as part of my remarks all of the testimony before the subcommittee that pertains to simplified spelling. The bill before you, printed by order of the House and for its use, is printed in the old form or style of orthography. There has been current a rumor in newspapers that the Supreme Court by some dicta or utterance has declared that these and other matters should be printed in the old form. I can state to the House there has been no such official declaration. It would seem that the Solicitor-General of the United States recently, in submitting to the court a brief, had his attention called to it by the Chief Justice, who stated that in quoting to the court any authority the use of simplified spelling was not a literal quotation. That, I believe, is all the Supreme Court has uttered upon the subject of simplified or old-style spelling. The printing of the Supreme Court continues to be done according to the old style of spelling, the court having given no instructions to use the simplified form. I think that will cover all that I desire to say at this time with reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I wondered what gave this matter such gravity and importance as to justify Congress to enact a law fixing the style of orthography. Is there any economy or other reason—

Mr. BINGHAM. I believe if the gentleman will hold his inquiry in abeyance until he reads what I may have to say in tomorrow's Record he will get the whole discussion in the committee with the Public Printer, together with his proof reader and chief of printing, which exhibits exactly, as near as we can reach, what the addition of expense will be. As to complications, perhaps we would not have them in the House in the matter of spelling, as they would in quotations before the Supreme Court, but I have simply called attention to the proposed action in order that, as debate will perhaps continue for several days, the whole subject might be gone into, illuminated, if it is possible, by the report we have to submit from the Public Printer. There is nothing, I may say further, beyond a general discussion in print, as well as conversations of men, especially here, that one print directed by the Congress for the printing of a bill would be in one form and the print submitted by the Treasury Department in the estimates in another form. We want, so far as the legislative branch of the Government is concerned, that there should be a consistency in our printing.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, unless there be something above the mere establishment of uniformity I do not think Congress ought to enact any legislation on the question at all, because the standard of spelling is virtually of usage, and spelling is improving all the time. There is a gradual evolution in spelling words in the English language. I think there ought to be. I think I may be satisfied when I read the gentleman's speech.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is one matter which will come up very early when you reach the bill, and it might be well to refer to it at this time.

On page 21 of the printed bill, and I advert to it early in order that it may form part of the early debate, because it comes very early in the consideration of the bill, is the following paragraph:

For clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member and Delegate for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$1,500 per annum, in monthly installments, \$594,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation.

For the information of the House I have been requested to repeat the amount, namely, \$1,500, in lieu of the present law of \$1,200. I would submit that in the Senate there is one committee—

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER]?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. Before leaving that point I want to ask the gentleman to state to the House what distinction there is in the

matter of drawing the salary of a clerk under the old law and under the proposed law?

Mr. BINGHAM. Under the old law it is limited to \$100 per month, with a certification that the amount has been expended during that month. This puts the sum total of \$1,500 unqualifiedly under the control of the Member, with only this qualification, that the clerk has necessarily been employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, further—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. Then we know, do we not, that there is no certificate required to be made at all by the Member as a condition of his drawing the \$1,500?

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand that the \$1,500 is in his absolute control, to be expended during the year, without regard to the month.

Mr. KEIFER. Does it not look like it is adding \$1,500 to the salary of each Member?

Mr. BINGHAM. I can not answer the question. The House can do that.

Mr. McCALL. Would it not be necessary to certify that the clerk was necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his duties?

Mr. BINGHAM. Without a doubt.

Mr. KEIFER. I say there is no provision for a certificate to be required at all. It does put some little moral obligation upon the Member that he necessarily expend it, but that does not hurt anything.

Mr. McCALL. It seems to me there should be a certificate to comply with the law.

Mr. KEIFER. None whatever is provided for.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have made the statement just as the law reads to the House. When it comes up we can make such qualifications as we desire.

For the information of the House I will state that in the Senate there is one committee having a clerk at \$3,000; one committee having a clerk at \$2,500; forty committees having clerks at \$2,220; two committees having clerks at \$2,100; twenty-one committees having clerks at \$1,800; making sixty-five committees of the Senate having annual clerks. The chairmen of these committees have no other allowance for clerk hire. Twenty-five Senators who are not chairmen of committees are entitled to one clerk each, at \$1,800. These Senators have no other allowances for clerk hire. In the House there are two clerks of committees receiving \$3,000 each; thirty-two committees having clerks at \$2,000 each; ten committees having clerks at \$6 per day each during the session. All of the 392 Members and Delegates are entitled to an allowance at the rate of \$1,200 each per annum for clerk hire during the recess of Congress, and all of the Members and Delegates except those who are chairmen of a committee having clerks at \$6 per day are entitled to the allowance of \$1,200 per annum for clerk hire all the year round. The chairmen of committees having clerks at \$6 per day during the session receive no other allowance for clerk hire during the session.

I have no other general statement to make at this time. As debate progresses and criticism of the bill runs I may feel it necessary, as other members of the committee may, to defend the provisions of the bill.

I emphasize the statement that this bill in its build-up is consistent with the current law. The Book of Estimates for next year has been investigated by the same subcommittee that considered the estimates for the current fiscal year, and has been acted upon by the same general committee. I hope and believe that this House can find it in its power, in view of the presentation of this bill in its many qualifications, that there can be consummated after the reading of the bill the passage of the same, as has heretofore occurred, in one day, several times in two days.

The following is from the hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

SIMPLIFIED SPELLING.

Mr. LITTAUER. We find in the next paragraph the word "catalog," and below the word "cataloguer," and we would like to know why you have changed the orthography of the documents that you have sent here?

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any statute that gives the President authority in any way to change the spelling—have you looked into that?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, if a Department should want to change the spelling from what is known as the normal or usual spelling, you would accept the order?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under the order of the President the Departments were ordered to have spelling done that way, and would naturally have to obey the order.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is nothing in the statute that authorizes him to give that order, either for or against that proposition?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why did you, then, print these bills under that special spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know why it should have been done in this case.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is not the Book of Estimates printed in the same manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. The Book of Estimates emanates from the Treasury Department and is printed at the Treasury branch. An effort has been made to carry out the President's order in reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Book of Estimates is printed at the Treasury branch?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. This bill is printed in your office?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. In printing this bill, then, your employees must have followed the spelling contained in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. STILLINGS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAWNEY. And that is how it came about?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if this was copied from a departmental document which was prepared on the simplified spelling lines.

Mr. TAWNEY. What was the President's order, and have you a copy of it?

Mr. STILLINGS. I have not a copy here.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will you kindly furnish a copy of the order and have it appear in connection with your testimony?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
Oyster Bay, N. Y., August 27, 1906.

MY DEAR MR. STILLINGS: I inclose herewith copies of certain circulars of the Simplified Spelling Board, which can be obtained free from the board at No. 1 Madison avenue, New York City. Please hereafter direct that in all Government publications of the Executive Departments the 300 words enumerated in circular No. 5 shall be spelled as therein set forth. If anyone asks the reason for the action, refer him to circulars 3, 4, and 6, as issued by the Simplified Spelling Board. Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and common-sense views as to the purposes to be achieved, which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy. The purpose simply is for the Government, instead of lagging behind popular sentiment, to advance abreast of it and at the same time abreast of the views of the ablest and most practical educators of our time, as well as of the most profound scholars—men of the stamp of Professor Lounsbury and Professor Skeat.

If the slight changes in the spelling of the 300 words proposed wholly or partially meet popular approval, then the changes will become permanent without any reference to what public officials or individual private citizens may feel; if they do not ultimately meet with popular approval they will be dropped, and that is all there is about it. They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough," which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u;" and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me"—just as all people who speak English now write "bat," "set," "dim," "sum," and "fish," instead of the Elizabethan "batte," "sette," "dimme," "summe," and "fyshe;" which makes us write "public," "almanac," "era," "fantasy," and "wagon" instead of the "publick," "almanack," "aera," "phantasy," and "waggon" of our great-grandfathers. It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time. It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent; or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. CHARLES A. STILLINGS,
Public Printer, Washington.

Mr. TAWNEY. Was there any reference in the order to the report of a board on simplified spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I was referred to the report of a board on simplified spelling.

Mr. BINGHAM. How many words does the new spelling book contain?

Mr. STILLINGS. Three hundred.

Mr. TAWNEY. Three hundred words the spelling of which was changed by the report of this board?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; many of the 300 words in this were already in preferred use.

Mr. TAWNEY. In looking over the names of the men constituting this board I notice Mr. Isaac K. Funk, editor and publisher of the Standard Dictionary. In the event that Congress adopted the simplified spelling by having Congressional documents and laws printed in accordance with the report of this board, would it be necessary to get out a new dictionary?

Mr. STILLINGS. I think it would ultimately; yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I notice, also, the names of Mr. Charles P. G. Scott, etymological editor of the Century Dictionary; Mr. E. O. Vaile, of Chicago. Do you know what business he is engaged in?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I also notice the names of Mr. Benjamin E. Smith, editor of the Century Dictionary, New York, and Henry Holt, a publisher of New York. Is that a school-book publishing house?

Mr. STILLINGS. I understand it to be.

Mr. TAWNEY. The adoption by Congress of this form of spelling would ultimately, and in the very near future, no doubt, necessitate the publication of a new dictionary and new school books and their purchase by the citizens of the United States?

Mr. STILLINGS. That would probably be the result.

Mr. LITTAUER. It was a mistake, according to your opinion, to print this bill in this manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. Certainly; Congressional printing was not contemplated in the President's order.

Mr. BINGHAM. As matters now stand with reference to spelling, suppose Congress directs the publication or the issuance of a thousand copies of a report, a publication from one of the Departments, what spelling would you adopt?

Mr. STILLINGS. We should follow the usual style.
Mr. BINGHAM. So that the general publications of the Government without any act of Congress or any movement on the part of the Executive would be printed in the old spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. Where the order comes from Congress we have no authority to change the spelling.

Mr. LITTAUER. Let us get at the effect of this order on your work. In the first place, we will say that a Department sends you copy and it is in the new spelling. You then simply set up the type in accordance with that order, do you not?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it were a document that would require submission to Congress and Congress should declare that all documents coming to Congress should be in the usual spelling, would it require the resetting of the type?

Mr. STILLINGS. It would require the correcting of that portion of the standing type or plate wherein the changes had to be made.

Mr. LITTAUER. On each page or on every two or three pages?

Mr. STILLINGS. Possibly once every two pages.

Mr. LITTAUER. And if it was set up on a linotype machine?

Mr. STILLINGS. We would have to cast a new slug.

Mr. TAWNEY. What, in your judgment, approximately, would be the additional expense of those changes?

Mr. STILLINGS. That is something I do not know, because we have never had an occasion to try it out. Here is the point that must be thought out: The bulk of our documents are printed from plates.

Mr. LITTAUER. Could the plates be changed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if you are going to change from the simplified to the usual spelling, you would make the changes on the plate in most cases. How much of it would be done is very difficult to estimate. The foreman of our proof division, from his experience in handling copy, seems to feel that it would not be so radical a change as appears on the surface. Of course you can see that if a document comes to you with the word "through" spelled without the "ough," we might possibly be able to insert the "ough" by respacing the line so as to get in the extra letters. If we could not, we would have to run over each line in that paragraph, or enough lines to finally come out even with good justification.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it was on a plate you would have to destroy the plate and make a new one?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; we could set the paragraph up, electrotype it, and patch it onto the original plate.

Mr. LITTAUER. You would not be able to tell what the expense would be in the case of an ordinary pamphlet of 30 or 35 pages?

Mr. STILLINGS. It is very difficult to estimate.

Mr. BURLESON. Where are the Supreme Court reports printed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under contract by a commercial printing house. We do a large amount of work for the Supreme Court; the cases, among other items.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you propose to make the change there?

Mr. STILLINGS. They have objected. Recently the question of simplified spelling came up.

Mr. LITTAUER. Is it not going to lead to a great deal of confusion?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. The Supreme Court have refused to follow the simplified mode of spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. And necessarily we are going to have the executive branch of the Government, as to the President's message, spelling one way and another department of the Government spelling another way?

Mr. STILLINGS. That is right.

Mr. BINGHAM. Up to this date have you issued any Government publication using the new spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. There are quite a number of publications that have been issued in the simplified spelling. Here is another point that came up. In the case of a serial which was started last January—and the question came up immediately, Shall we use simplified spelling for the balance of the year or not? Instructions came from the President that wherever the work had been started in the usual spelling it should be continued. The President has been very broad-gauged in the matter of simplified spelling, stating that there was no desire to force this proposition and that if it was not a popular move it would be dropped.

Mr. LITTAUER. Have you had any other protests except from the Supreme Court?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have had a protest from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in connection with the word "gauger;" from the Navy Department also; from the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce and Labor in connection with work in serial form. We have had a query regarding it from the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Mr. LITTAUER. What has been the practice in the Government Printing Office; spelling has been to a certain extent changed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. What recognition of the progression in spelling has the Public Printer taken?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have been largely guided, in fact almost entirely governed, by the action of the publishers of Webster's Dictionary.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any difference between the Webster and Worcester Dictionary?

Mr. STILLINGS. I know very little about the Worcester Dictionary; I have not examined it recently.

Mr. ROBINSON, foreman of proof division, Government Printing Office, was questioned as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. We would like to have you tell us the extra work in the various processes that have to be gone through from one spelling to the other, changing the plates, and so on, and the probable cost that will be entailed by the use of simplified spelling in some publications and not in others.

Mr. ROBINSON. You mean the change from one to the other?

Mr. TAWNEY. An executive document comes to the Public Printer to be printed in the simplified form and is also sent to Congress and becomes an executive document and is printed by Congress in the old form.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the labor of the proof reader and the compositor correcting the work from the new to the old would probably be the principal part of the cost.

Mr. BURLESON. Is there any other difficulty that is involved?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think there is no other difficulty; it is simply a matter of reading the proof and of catching the words, and sending it to the compositor, and the compositor would correct the type.

Mr. LITTAUER. Correcting the type, would not that be an expense?

Mr. ROBINSON. Somewhat, but not very high.

Mr. LITTAUER. How much would it cost if there were ten changes on a page?

Mr. ROBINSON. I estimate that there is not an average of two words to the page ordinarily, and taking the average of those words, the words that require different spaces, I should think a man should correct those pages at the rate of three to five minutes to a page. He is paid 50 cents an hour for that work. He ought to correct twenty pages in an hour.

Mr. LITTAUER. What would be the total expense in a day's work done at the Office?

Mr. ROBINSON. The proof would not necessarily have to be read very carefully, because you are only looking for those particular words.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is 160 pages at a cost of 50 cents an hour?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is for the compositor. The proof reading would cost 50 per cent more. He does not have to read it closely because he is only looking for those words. He only looks for the words that are to be changed from one spelling to another. It would be an experiment—I can not tell exactly, but I think he ought to read 100 pages a day—he might read 150 pages a day.

Mr. TAWNEY. And he gets how much an hour?

Mr. ROBINSON. Fifty-eight and a half cents an hour.

Mr. TAWNEY. And works eight hours a day?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir; the cost would not be over 4 cents a page. I suppose the cost would be from 3 to 4 cents a page.

Mr. BURLESON. When a proof reader has a certain document that he is reading, if it is set up in the simplified method of spelling he reads it a certain way, and if the same proof reader has another document following that in the old style of spelling he has a difficult task of reading one document one way and immediately thereafter reading another document another way. It is a little wearing on his intellectual faculties?

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no doubt about that. I have here a couple of specimens [exhibiting.] There is the new spelling and there is the old spelling. The editor marks it, as you see, and when the proof reader gets that he knows at once what to do with that galley, if he is at all familiar with the list of words.

Mr. BURLESON. He is required to commit those words to memory?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. And he must be familiar with the entire dictionary?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. YOUNG, foreman of printing, Government Printing Office, was questioned as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. When we come to the plates would there be any greater expense?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think that would amount to any more.

Mr. LITTAUER. Than the correction of the type?

Mr. YOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. How much do you think it would cost to make two changes on a page?

Mr. YOUNG. It would probably take five minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. You would have to handle every plate?

Mr. YOUNG. No; just as I hold this book you would go down to the page that you want and you would take the plate out and correct it and put it back.

Mr. LITTAUER. One man would have to go over the plates and give the correct page plate to another man?

Mr. YOUNG. Not necessarily. He would have to go down to the vault and get it; the plates are not kept upstairs.

Mr. LITTAUER. Can these plates be readily changed from one form of spelling to another?

Mr. YOUNG. They can be changed, but a plate correction is always a bad thing. I do not think a plate correction should ever be made if it can be avoided.

Mr. LITTAUER. The proof reading would be more expensive than the changing of the plate?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. You spoke about these plates, that is, with the 300 words now adopted?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Now, suppose they adopt the next batch, say, 1,200 words?

Mr. YOUNG. Then it would be out of the question.

Mr. BURLESON. It would increase the number of changes on each page?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I notice in the report of the Comptroller of the Treasury the spelling is "Controller."

Mr. YOUNG. He sanctioned that.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Comptroller of the Currency refused to accept the form of spelling for his office?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; he stands on the ground that the statute calls him Comptroller instead of Controller.

Mr. TAWNEY. The statute spells the title of the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury the same as the Comptroller of the Currency?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; the Comptroller of the Treasury does not take the same view of it that the other man does.

Mr. TAWNEY. The head of every bureau could have his official designation spelled according to his own idea?

Mr. ROBINSON. It is only a matter of opinion. The Comptroller of the Treasury says he will accept either spelling. He says Controller is right, but if we print it Comptroller it is all right—he will accept it. The Comptroller of the Currency will not have it so.

Mr. TAWNEY. If we have this dual form for the legislative and executive departments of the Government the proof reading is virtually duplicated on all work that first goes to the Printing Office and then is authorized to be reprinted or republished by Congress?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; anything that emanates from a Department.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is why proof reading is the principal expense in the form of the spelling unless it is made uniform in all the several departments of the Government?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that, as a member of the subcommittee making up this bill, we did not have that length of time to consider the bill that we had last session. We spent several days upon it, looking into the details of the bill.

The usual objections in the Committee of the Whole to increase in salaries, I think, Mr. Chairman, will not prevail at

this time, if Members will remember that in the estimates there were 202 increases called for and the committee has given only 29.

I am aware of the fact that those who are left out will complain and wonder why we put in the 29 increases. It appeared to the Appropriation Committee the right thing to do—the proper thing to do at this time—to increase these 29 salaries. The increases are all set out in the report, and I hope Members will not require me to go over them in detail. Each increase is separately set out in the report. Some of them were, perhaps, more deserving than others. I am informed that the President will send a special message to this House and Senate in a day or two asking an increase all along the line of 20 per cent. This rumor seems to be well founded. I am aware of the fact that a majority of the Keep Commission has recommended an increase all along the line. Of course, it will be left to the wisdom of this House to determine whether we can afford to do that or not. We must take into consideration as a matter of course, the revenues on hand or estimated to be available when we come to disburse the money. That proposition Members will each have to consider for themselves, and will come up later on its merits.

I desire to say just here, and I think every Member upon the floor will bear me out, that the cost of living is getting outrageously high in Washington City. Whether it is simply a rise in the cost of necessities of living—clothes, food, rent, fuel, heat, and light, and of other articles of necessary consumption—or whether it is in part owing to extravagance, I will not undertake to say. The fact exists all the same.

There is one matter left out of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that I want to bring to the attention of southern Members especially. I also want to appeal to all Members to consider fairly and give cotton producers and spinners a square deal. In our last appropriation bill we had this clause:

For compensation at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses to special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the view of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products.

I shall add "and cotton-seed products."

And the result of such investigation shall be reported to Congress. I shall at the proper time move to reinstate the clause.

I am aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that our eastern and western friends, that raise no cotton, will say, "Why put in this bill a particular product, as they are interested in other products." Twenty thousand dollars of this amount—\$50,000—is specially appropriated for those things. A Senator at the other end of the Capitol amended and put in \$20,000 for cotton products. You must remember, gentlemen, that while the people of the South raise the cotton, they spin a very small amount of it. That is done by the East and the Middle States; so you are just as much interested as we of the South are. When you remember that out of all the cotton fabrics exported into the world, England made the great bulk of them; four hundred and more millions furnished by her to the other markets of the world, and this country only fifty-seven millions. That is the trouble we are endeavoring to get at. I ask, why do not China and Japan and Russia and the other divisions and subdivisions of the earth buy from us? It is simply because England has pushed her trade and made it apparent to the world that she has the market and the control of this crop and its products.

But if the United States Government will continue this \$50,000 appropriation and this part of it set apart to cotton and its fabrics, the world will soon get acquainted with the fact that we can supply these same goods just as cheaply and of just as good quality, and we will get, perhaps, our share of the commerce of the world on this line. It was this object at first, and it is the object now, if we can reinsert it in the bill.

Again, why should cotton be specified? For the reason that during the last five years, three years out of five, the exportations of cotton have paid the balance against this Government and saved us from a financial panic.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman means raw cotton, does he not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am speaking about raw cotton now. Any commodity produced in this country that will save us from financial panics ought to have some attention and some legislation, and if we can broaden our markets for raw cotton and its products, it is of the utmost importance that we should do it.

There is also \$30,000 in the amendment to broaden our market for other manufactures. I have no objection to implements and boots and shoes being added, if they were not already cared for and already covered in that \$30,000.

Mr. CANDLER. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The amount of the appropriation is \$50,000, \$30,000 for outside products and \$20,000 for cotton.

Mr. LEVER. Is cotton seed included in that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Cotton-seed products are included in this amendment, to be inserted in the bill when it is considered under the five-minute rule. I shall offer a motion to reinstate the current law with this amendment, to insert after the word "cotton" the words "and cotton-seed products."

Mr. MANN. What is the item?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the item in the present law giving \$50,000, of which thirty thousand is given to general manufactured articles and \$20,000 to cotton products.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not refer to the item about commercial agents abroad, does he?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understand there was an item inserted last year for special agents to investigate trade conditions in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is right.

Mr. MANN. Is that the item the gentleman has reference to?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is the item.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman propose to endeavor to reinsert that item?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do.

Mr. MANN. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am giving notice of it now, that when we come to that section of the bill under the five-minute rule I will move to reinsert it.

Mr. CANDLER. It was in the bill last year?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the current law. The point of order can not lie against it. The point of order can lie against my amendment as to cotton-seed products, but it can not lie against the paragraph now current law.

Mr. CANDLER. Do you propose to endeavor to secure the same appropriation as last year?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The same appropriation as the current law. If it were otherwise, it would be subject to a point of order.

There are some limitations on this bill that I want to call your attention to. The first one is:

Hereafter, in printing documents authorized by law and ordered by Congress, or either branch thereof, the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

There are many reasons why that ought to be done. In the first place every school book in the United States, in every schoolroom, college, or university would have to be abolished, and a new lot of school books republished and bought by the patrons of the schools. That would be an enormous expenditure.

In addition to this enormous expense, it creates derangement and confusion worse confounded in all parts of the Government Printing Office; all the stereotype plates in the Office would have to be reformed. I am not authorized to say what the President's message cost in the saving of 113 words, but the rumor comes from a very good source that it cost \$760 to save those 113 words. I want it understood that I am not stating that authoritatively, but I understand it is about that amount.

It makes no difference, Mr. Chairman, how advantageous it might seem from some point of view, but you can all see at a glance what a revolution this new spelling would work in our schools and colleges, in printing offices, and in every newspaper office throughout the country.

There is another good reason for it. We are tied to a language spoken by people all over the world, and especially in Great Britain and Canada. Now, when we undertake to revolutionize the English language in that way we must consult those who use it with us; it is nothing but right that we should consult them. Are we to follow all along the line a spelling that would follow phonetic pronunciation? If so, then we would have one spelling in France, another in Germany, a different one in the South Central American States, where none pronounce English words as we pronounce them.

There is another limitation here. In the Treasury Department until recently they have always furnished the Committee on Appropriations with an estimate of about how much money we can spend—that is, estimating the revenues for the coming year. The present Secretary refused to do this last year, and your committee, or its chairman and clerk, had to make that estimate. That is not a safe way of doing business. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations must know as near as possible about how much money will be available for appropriations and disbursements. It is made the duty, by this limitation, of the Secretary of the Treasury to give us that estimate.

The next limitation, on page 4, is one which in my opinion by all means should be left in the bill. Let me read it:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, or office shall be transferred on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles-lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Some of our departmental libraries we discovered were filled with fiction of the cheapest kind. I am informed that when the Spanish war closed, one of our Departments, finding several thousands of volumes of this cheap fiction on their hands, shipped it all to the Philippines. I don't think that was good policy, for if it was not fit to be read here, it certainly was not fit to send to those people. I am informed that another Department has about 50,000 volumes scattered through the city in the hands of private parties. Our purpose is to draw these books back into the hands of the Departments.

We have gone a step further and provided that any of such books or periodicals in these libraries that do not come within this limitation must be sent to the Carnegie Library of Washington or to the Congressional Library.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether the gentleman is aware of the practice, but it is a fact that in the Light-House Service we have a good many light-houses located off the shore in the water, where the keepers do not get ashore once a month, and sometimes in the winter not as often as that. The Government provides them with a small library. Of course, it would be nonsense to provide them with technical books merely for study. These books are provided for the purpose of reading light literature, and are passed on from one light-house to another.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman state under what provision of law those books are furnished?

Mr. MANN. Under an appropriation for light-house supplies, I suppose. I should think that would be a very proper appropriation; they are furnished as other necessities of the light-house.

Mr. LITTAUER. Then they would not belong to the departmental libraries here in Washington?

Mr. MANN. I do not think they would.

Mr. LITTAUER. Then this provision would not apply to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They could not be affected by this limitation. I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he might offer an amendment to supply all the light-houses from this source instead of having them turned back into the Carnegie and Congressional libraries; they might be contributed to the life-saving stations.

Mr. MANN. It might be a very good way. I had read over the limitation, and I did feel certain that it did not apply.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; it does not apply. I will read it over again:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, or office shall be transferred, on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles-lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Mr. MANN. I think it would, myself, the way it reads.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] thinks so, he may make the exception when the bill comes up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to know whether they were intended to cover anything outside of Washington.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They were not. Mr. Chairman, there is another matter which the committee has reported to which I wish to refer. We have increased the salary of the clerks of the Members from \$1,200 to \$1,500. My opinion in the committee—and it is my opinion still—was that these clerks should go on the rolls and have \$1,500 paid to them direct. There are some objections to that. One very good one is that some Members have two clerks and divide the salary between the two, taking one

home with them and leaving one in Washington. There is another objection to it that can be easily met, and that is that the Congressman ought to control his own clerk absolutely, dismiss him when he pleases or reinstate him when he pleases. That can be easily arranged, even if the clerk be on the rolls. The justice and absolute necessity for this increase is patent to every man. It has been charged that we have been taking this amount of money, some of us, and using it as an increase of our own salaries. The committee is not aware of the fact that that has been the practice. We have no proof of it. But to get rid of all scandal—all liability to scandal of every kind—this clerk ought to go on the rolls and be paid by the Sergeant-at-Arms as we are paid, with the power left in the hands of the Member or Delegate to dismiss that clerk at any time. It is not intended, and never was intended, as an increase to our salaries, and on that subject let me say that we purpose in some way or somehow while this bill is under consideration to test this House as to whether you want to increase your salaries or not. If these clerks go on the rolls it can not be charged that we are increasing our salaries indirectly, which is now charged, and if our salaries are not sufficient to decently maintain a Congressman and his family here while the session lasts, then say so to the public and increase your salaries in the bill, and I am sure your constituency will approve it. If you have no reason for it, they will not indorse it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What do the clerks of Senators receive aside from those who are employed by the chairmen of committees?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One thousand eight hundred dollars a year.

Mr. GOULDEN. Why this discrimination between the Senators and the clerks of Members of the House?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There should be none.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is there any explainable reason for it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There is no reason for it. There is no reason why there should be a difference, and I want to say just here that all salaries ought to be on all fours wherever possible. To have it otherwise creates discontent and unrest. Where one man is doing the same work that another does, in the same hours, spending the same amount of money to live, it is not reasonable, it is not fair, that these differences in salaries should remain as they are now. That condition obtains among our clerks in the Departments, and it ought not to be so. It ought not to be the condition between the House and the Senate, and I am more than willing that the Senate should come down to \$1,500 or that we should go up to \$1,800. If they can show this House that \$1,800 is a fair salary for their clerks, then we ought to put ours up to \$1,800. If they can not do it, then they ought to put theirs down to \$1,500. They certainly ought to be on all fours in this bill. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him another question. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he regards it as good policy to increase the salaries of the employees of this House when there is a committee regularly appointed to take charge of these matters, and when that committee has had before it many of the salaries that are now proposed to be increased in this bill—whether the gentleman considers that to be good policy and courteous treatment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that if there is a committee of this House whose business it is to recommend the increases of salaries of House employees, that perhaps the Appropriations Committee should let those alone. But I understand that there is no salary increased of employees of this House except by the consent of the chairman of that committee, and perhaps the members of that committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. As a member of the Committee on Accounts, I desire to say that a number of these, four or five of them at least, were before our committee in the last session, and were not reported favorably.

Mr. LITTAUER. Which ones?

Mr. GOULDEN. The minority employees and those in the Sergeant-at-Arms department in charge of the pairs were not reported at all, though a strong pressure was brought to bear on the members of the committee, but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a committee having charge of this matter it should be given the duties as well as responsibilities. I have no objection personally to the matter as reported by the gentleman's committee, but I do think that the committee in charge of the matter, that of Accounts, should at least be treated with courtesy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility can not be delivered by the Committee on Appropriations. That responsibility is given by the House and the committee is appointed and its limitation of duty fixed, and therefore we could not give you the authority nor take it away from you, but as a matter of courtesy, I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, if this committee is charged with that duty these increases of salaries of the employees of the House should come from that committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. I agree with you. As I said, personally I have no objection to the increases. I believe in good salaries, and in return would demand faithful services. I merely suggested it belonged to that committee, and I do not think the Committee on Appropriations mean to interfere with the privileges of any committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman why he has not acted on these increases?

Mr. GOULDEN. Because we were in doubt whether they were entitled to the increase and for a lack of time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I mean this session.

Mr. GOULDEN. We have not yet had an opportunity to take them up.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will you indorse these increases?

Mr. GOULDEN. It is a very ungracious thing, indeed, to make the point of order which I think would lie against these increases, and I shall not do it as a member of the committee. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Accounts on the floor of the House, but personally I shall interpose no objection, but let the Committee on Appropriations take the responsibility in the matter.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would like to add one word, if my colleague will permit me, here, and that is the Committee on Appropriations acts upon the estimates and recommendations of the heads of bureaus and departments. The case of the three pair clerks was recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, and consequently considered by them.

Mr. GOULDEN. The same recommendation has been made to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LITTAUER. That we were not advised of or were not particularly aware of, although we understood last session there was some discussion about this subject.

Mr. GOULDEN. There was considerable.

Mr. LITTAUER. But it came to us and we considered it in the regular way.

Mr. GOULDEN. But does not the gentleman think it would have been at least courteous and right to have ascertained from the Committee on Accounts whether it had taken any action or not?

Mr. LITTAUER. Under the circumstances, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me a word. It was certainly not the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to be discourteous to the gentleman's committee. The information we received came to the committee, as it always does, from the officers of the House in charge or supervision of the subordinate force. As this was a matter distinctly for the House's convenience and comfort of the Members and an expedition of the House's work, we saw no impropriety in placing them in the bill, and certainly no discourtesy was intended toward the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GOULDEN. I wish to disclaim all intention of reflecting upon the Committee on Appropriations as being discourteous to our committee. I know them individually too well and know that they would not be guilty of anything of the kind.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I presume that some of the Members of this House read, as I did in some of Saturday's papers, that I held up the Committee on Appropriations for three or four hours by a discussion of the new spelling, and in that way had delayed the progress in this House of that bill for that length of time. I only wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the correspondent who gave that report must have been an easy mark for some ingenious person who had fake news to dispose of, because there was absolutely not the slightest foundation for the statement. The whole discussion in the committee did not take five minutes. It was entirely good humored, and the words which were put in my mouth were fabricated, and the whole statement was without foundation except for the fact that we spent a few minutes very informally in discussing the question. But inasmuch as it has been so exaggerated, and inasmuch as I have had sentiments put into my mouth which I did not ex-

press, I will take now a few minutes to state my position on the subject. I do believe in a simplification of our spelling. I have not been particularly intense in that opinion. Personally, I should have been willing that the movement should go on as it has been going on for many years, simplifying our complicated and barbarous spelling by the constant usage of the public, and of the publishers, and of the newspapers. It seems to me that it is exceedingly desirable that that steady progress should continue, because the English language is gradually becoming the commercial language of the globe.

As we all wish that that process shall continue it seems to me we all must feel that it will tend to increase that progress to have our spelling as simple and methodical as possible and to have the various idiosyncracies and inconsistencies which frighten and confuse a stranger removed as far as can be done without interfering with the etymology or history of words. French has long been the court language of the world, but English is now getting to be the commercial language, and I think in the future courts will be much more likely to take the language of the people than the people will be likely to take the language of the courts, and it is not unreasonable to expect that, as all North America uses English, as Australia uses it, as India is a center for it, and the Philippines is a center for it, it will gradually become a universal commercial language. And so we should all be interested in making that language as simple and uniform as possible. I can see no reason why this steady progress toward simplicity, which we all must observe in our personal usage, should not be hastened. Most of us do not use the letter "u" in "honor" or "candor" any longer, and the most of us spell "plough" "plow."

Most of us are constantly falling in with the simplifications of the language, and now when I am faced with the proposition of shortening 300 specific words on the recommendation of a studious committee of public-spirited men, it seems to me a more rapid step toward accomplishing what our natural instinct is slowly accomplishing, and for that reason I favor it. There is only one objection I have to their list. I confess that the word "through" spelled as "t-h-r-u" does not appeal to me, and I can not see why that spelling was inserted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman calculated how long it would take to modify the English language at the rate of 300 words a year?

Mr. GILLET. No; I have not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would take four hundred years. Now, one other question. If you are going into this modification business at all—

Mr. GILLET. May I ask the gentleman what he means by saying that it would take four hundred years to do it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To remodel the spelling of three hundred thousand words in the English language.

Mr. GILLET. They do not all need it, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The most of them do, as much as these 300 words.

Mr. GILLET. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, another question. If you are going into this remodeling business, why not go the whole hog and take the phonetic system of spelling that has forty-four letters in it, and that absolutely abolishes the task or stunt of learning to spell at all?

Mr. GILLET. That would interfere in many cases with the derivation or history of words. This does not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not one man out of forty thousand who cares anything about derivation at all, is there?

Mr. GILLET. I think there are many more than that. I do—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, you propose to make a commercial language—

Mr. GILLET. I hope that is what we are growing to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope our language will become a commercial language, but these men that are engaged in commerce do not stop to study etymology.

Mr. GILLET. They do not; but does the gentleman mean that he favors the phonetic system?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I mean this, that this 300-words business is such an infinitesimal reform that if I was going into the reform business at all I would at one jump adopt the phonetic system of spelling and the shorthand system of writing, and do away with the double task of learning how to spell and write, the learning how to write the way we write now. Then you would have a reform that is a reform.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman's suggestion seems to me in accord with many suggestions that are made in this House by gentlemen opposed to a measure. He objects to a slight step on the ground that he would take some other step which everybody knows is impossible. That is what is often done by a Member in this House as a means of defeating a measure. Now, I do not think that such a criticism as that is very weighty. The gentleman knows that we are not going to adopt phonetic spelling. That is impossible at the present. But he also knows that we are every year simplifying our spelling by ordinary use—the ordinary popular use—and here is a simple attempt to somewhat accelerate the progress which is going on from year to year. And as I approve of all of this progress that is going on, so I approve of this acceleration. It is not a revolution. We can not effect any such phonetic revolution as the gentleman suggests. I do not know whether I would favor it, but I do not think it is practicable. We only consider what is before us, and here is a practical suggestion that comes which seems to be sensible and right and in accord with what we are doing all the time. Therefore I shall be very glad if the House will adopt it.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MACON. If this simplified spelling were to be adopted, would it not necessitate the abolition of spelling books now being used in all the schools of the country?

Mr. GILLETT. Why of course not. Our changing it does not make it necessary to change school books. I have no doubt that in the next edition of the school books they would probably adopt it themselves, but they are not compelled to do it.

Mr. MACON. Then if the school books should not follow it, why do you want it? Why have a boy taught to spell one way and then when he gets through with his education have to learn to spell another way?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman makes that assumption contrary to the idea that I have been endeavoring to express. I say that the country would follow it up gradually. It does not follow that because we adopt these 300 words this year that all the school books must be changed immediately. It is not a radical revolutionary change. It is a small and moderate change. It does not follow that all the school books must be changed, but they would follow it up gradually. I think many of these words are already spelled so in the school books.

Mr. MACON. If the school books all have to be changed, it would work a hardship on those who have to buy them.

Mr. GILLETT. There are only 300 words. It is not a revolution in our spelling. It is only what I have attempted to show before—a little acceleration of the change which is going on every year in the newspapers, and in our own correspondence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he is in favor of this reform made in the spelling of the word "through" by spelling it "t-h-r-u"?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not think that is the correct way, because we pronounce "through" as if it were spelt "t-h-r-o-o" and not "t-h-r-u." It seems to me that entirely confuses the vowels.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But did not the President in his message use the word "t-h-r-u" all the way through? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. I presume he did.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then your remark is a reflection upon the wisdom of the President.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not agree with the President in all that he says and does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. GILLETT. Now, I just wanted to make this statement of my position, because the newspaper statement of it was an unfounded fabrication. If anybody has anything further to suggest in reference to what I have said—

Mr. SULLIVAN. May I ask the gentleman where he can find any authority under our system of government which enables the President to order the spelling of his message in the manner in which he has done it?

Mr. GILLETT. I have not looked into that. I suppose that he has the same right to spell as he chooses that I have and that you have.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would ask, then, whether a member of the present Cabinet who has in his department a printing plant independent of the Government Printing Office has the right to inflict his personal ideas of spelling upon the great body of men who are afterwards to read these public documents; and if so, where does he get that right?

Mr. GILLETT. I suppose he has exactly the same authority that I have in writing.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Let me ask this further question. Now,

why is it that the Public Printer spells public documents in a manner other than the usual one? Where does he get the authority to do that?

Mr. GILLETT. Who?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The Public Printer.

Mr. GILLETT. I say I think he has a right to do so until we tell him differently. He is our servant, and he must obey our directions.

Mr. SULLIVAN. My question is, Whence did he derive that right? From what did it proceed?

Mr. GILLETT. Every man has a right to spell as he pleases. I suppose he has the same right that the rest of us have, if he has not any instructions to the contrary. We each of us could order our speeches to be spelled exactly according to our manuscript.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Then the gentleman's idea is that if the Public Printer chose deliberately to misspell all the words in a public document because that method of spelling conformed to his idea of correct spelling, he might continue to do so until Congress ordered him to stop?

Mr. GILLETT. I think he might run that risk if he wanted to, but I do not think that is a practical suggestion. Of course no Public Printer would think of doing it. He would very soon receive orders from us.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think the President's notion of authority is the same as the gentleman's in that particular.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, perhaps I can elucidate briefly the gentleman's inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, of course.

Mr. BINGHAM. In the report of the hearing, which will be printed in the RECORD to-morrow, in connection with this subject of what is called simplified spelling, I made this inquiry:

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any statute that gives the President authority in any way to change the spelling—have you looked into that?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, if a Department should want to change the spelling from what is known as the normal or natural spelling, you would accept the order?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under the order of the President the Departments were ordered to have spelling done that way, and would naturally have to obey the order.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is nothing in the statute that authorizes him to give that order, either for or against that proposition?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why did you, then, print these bills under that special spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know why it should have been done in this case.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is not the Book of Estimates printed in the same manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. The Book of Estimates emanates from the Treasury Department, and is printed at the Treasury branch. An effort has been made to carry out the President's order in reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Book of Estimates is printed at the Treasury branch?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. This bill is printed in your office?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. In printing this bill, then, your employees must have followed the spelling contained in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. STILLINGS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAWNEY. And that is how it came about?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if this was copied from a departmental document which was prepared on the simplified spelling lines.

Mr. TAWNEY. What was the President's order, and have you a copy of it?

Mr. STILLINGS. I have not a copy here.

I will state to the gentleman that there will be printed with my remarks to-morrow the full order of the President to Mr. Stillings, the Public Printer.

Mr. GILLETT. I should suppose that naturally the Public Printer would print and his natural duty would be to print every document according to the manuscript sent, but I suppose, out of kindness to us, if he sees a mistake in our copy, he naturally corrects it, and I suppose he goes by some standard dictionary.

Mr. LITTAUER. The custom has been to follow Webster.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman draw a distinction between an official document and a private letter?

Mr. GILLETT. Of course there are differences. I do not know just what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For instance, I have a right to spell my name as I please, whether intentionally or ignorantly; but when the President is writing an official document to Congress should he not confine his spelling to the usual form as found in our statutes?

Mr. GILLETT. I think he could use Greek if he wanted to.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, he might use Moro or Tagalog, Filipino or German.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, I think that is entirely in his discretion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Or he might send a message here in Latin.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think the President would have that right?

Mr. GILLETT. I do. I think he could use what language or what spelling he chose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose he should issue a military proclamation affecting the Army or Navy of the United States, affecting the life, liberty, or property of a member of either, and that proclamation should come before the Supreme Court of the United States for consideration, and the President should spell it in his own way or get up a new word for each idea he undertook to express. Do you not think that the Supreme Court would be extremely embarrassed and would have to send for the President's dictionary, and possibly for the President himself to come and translate that message? It could be carried to that extreme, of course.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is confusing two things, it seems to me; he is confusing the right and the expediency. I think the President, or anyone else, has the right to spell and publish as he pleases. Of course in practice we are all going to exercise reason and good sense.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose he should spell the word "due" in this passage from the Constitution "due process of law"—suppose he should spell it "d-e-w." Do you not think that would be confusing to a man who was imprisoned under an order of the President, and would it not be confusing to the Supreme Court if his case should go there?

Mr. GILLETT. I don't think it would confuse the man.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Don't you think it would confuse the court?

Mr. GILLETT. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has not the Chief Justice been already confused by this new spelling?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know that he has. It might displease the court.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The Chief Justice asked a member of the bar—an officer of the Department of Justice, I believe—who had spelled a word in the Rooseveltian method, what he meant by it. The gentleman sees to what confusion it would yield.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from Tennessee is not distinguishing between expediency and the right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Massachusetts goes to the extent of saying that the President has a right to do what he pleases with official documents in spelling, and I take the ground that he has no right to do it, especially in matters that may come before the Supreme Court or Congress.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the President has the same right that we all have—to spell as he pleases.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know that the President wants to do right. I am a great admirer of President Roosevelt, but I am talking about the ridiculous proposition of having a message sent here to Congress spelled one way and Congress printing it as spelled in the RECORD, and alongside of it the proceedings of Congress spelling the identical same words in a different way.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] if he is a member of this Amalgamated Association for Simplified Spelling? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. No; I am not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, I want to read the President's letter to Mr. Stillings. It is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
OYSTER BAY, N. Y., August 27, 1906.

MY DEAR MR. STILLINGS: I inclose herewith copies of certain circulars of the Simplified Spelling Board, which can be obtained free from the board at No. 1 Madison avenue, New York City. Please hereafter direct that in all Government publications of the Executive Departments the 300 words enumerated in Circular No. 5 shall be spelled as therein set forth. If anyone asks the reason for the action, refer him to Circulars 3, 4, and 6, as issued by the Simplified Spelling Board. Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and common-sense views as to the purposes to be achieved, which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy. The purpose simply is for the Government, instead of lagging behind popular sentiment to advance abreast of it and at the same time abreast of the views of the ablest and most practical educators of our time, as well as of the most profound scholars—men of the stamp of Professor Lounsbury and Professor Skeat.

If the slight changes in the spelling of the 300 words proposed wholly or partially meet popular approval, then the changes will

become permanent without any reference to what public officials or individual private citizens may feel; if they do not ultimately meet with popular approval they will be dropped, and that is all there is about it. They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough," which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u;" and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me"—just as all people who speak English now write "bat," "set," "dim," "sum," and "fish." Instead of the Elizabethan "batte," "sette," "dimme," "summe," and "fyshe;" which make us write "public," "almanac," "era," "fantasy," and "wagon," instead of the "publick," "almanack," "aera," "phantasy," and "waggon" of our great-grandfathers. It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time. It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent; or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Hon. CHARLES A. STILLINGS,
Public Printer, Washington.

Mr. GILBERT. It seems that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all the members of that committee concede that this is not a governmental matter; that in spite of any legislation that we may enact, every college, every school, every teacher, every individual may still adhere to the old method of spelling. Now, would not the adoption of that new method tend to create a greater disorder and a greater degree of confusion in spelling rather than more harmony?

Mr. BINGHAM. All I can say to the gentleman is that we think that the qualification in this proposed amendment is right. It will come duly before the committee when we reach that paragraph in the bill, which will be early in its consideration. It reads as follows:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

It is simply, so far as this proposed amendment or legislation goes, a continuation of the existing system and existing orthography. That is its sole purpose. Now, the committee believe that in view of the presentation of the Book of Estimates of the bill that goes with it for the consideration of the committee, all that comes from the Secretary of the Treasury in official form for our consideration should be spelled in the usual system of orthography.

Mr. GILBERT. What I want to know is this: Is not Congress making itself ridiculous and absurd to enter upon that subject at all?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not think that the committee before whom the proposition is submitted in the form of a document to that committee, coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, makes it ridiculous in taking the sense of the committee and calling attention of Congress to it.

Mr. GILBERT. Might we not as well spend our time in regulating the color of our cravats? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me, the Committee on Appropriations is concerned with this matter from the financial and economical standpoint. We were met by the statement that if we were to continue two kinds of spelling in printing documents the extra cost in producing the publications of the Government would be a considerable one. The use of two methods would involve an extra cost for proof reading, an extra cost for changing type, and so forth.

Consequently, we felt that in trying to bring about economic administration of the Public Printer's office, it was well that some official mandate should be given where the authority rested to determine that the work of the Public Printer should be conducted in the most economic and, even, as we also believe, the proper way. The order of the President we recognize, but we also recognize the intimation—not the dictum—of the Supreme Court that if you are going to quote law in a printed brief you must quote it as the law reads and not quote it with some new style of spelling. Then other Departmental officers refused to have the spelling of their designations changed, because they are statutory. If we were to continue here or after in all these publications the necessity of having the proof reader go over them twice in order to inject this new spelling, and then for the printers and the plate makers and so on to change their work, it is quite plain that we will add considerable to the cost of the Public Printer's work; and it is from the standpoint of cost that we have submitted this matter of legislation here.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is entirely right, but that is apart from the question I propounded to the gentleman. We know that in the times of Queen Elizabeth the Parliament of England would sit for months fixing the price of tinware, of hats and shoes, etc., and we know that in the time

of Louis XIV the States-General would sit to settle questions of etiquette before the court; and I do not want the Congress of the United States to be guilty of what seems to me a piece of folly in passing a piece of legislation that no court would pay any attention to as being any part of any governmental function to be exercised by any Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman will understand this, that we are dealing just with the official documents, so far as this House or so far as Congress is concerned. Now, one point—the printing is in the simplified form, we will say. The question was put to Mr. Young, foreman of the Government Printing Office, on page 44 of the hearing, as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. Can these plates be readily changed from one form of spelling to another?

Mr. YOUNG. They can be changed, but a plate correction is always a bad thing. I do not think a plate correction should ever be made if it can be avoided.

Mr. LITTAUER. The proof reading would be more expensive than the changing of the plates?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. You spoke about these plates—that is, with the 300 words now adopted?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Now, suppose they adopt the next batch, say 1,200?

Mr. YOUNG. Then it would be out of the question.

That is the testimony of a practical man in that office.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the President of the United States have the right to authorize the reprint of certain executive documents?

Mr. BINGHAM. That I can not answer. I presume he has that right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We have a great many maps, for instance—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit, I will say that the President has not that right.

Mr. LITTAUER. The Public Printer is under Congress.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We order these executive documents containing these fine plates. They are the ordinary spelling. Under this new way of spelling all these plates would have to be changed, and it would cost a great deal of money to do it, of course, and take up a great deal of time, and so forth. Is that what the gentleman from whom you quote had in mind when he spoke about the "plates?"

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what the gentleman had in mind, all plates. He simply states that they can handle the 300 words, but when it comes to 1,200 or 1,500 words it is out of the question.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], that we have public documents that are printed in accordance with law and we have others printed by order of Congress. Now, under the present the Executive documents that are sent down to the printer to be printed, coming directly from the Executive Department to the Government Printing Office, will be printed under the Executive order in accordance with the rule of simplified spelling. Then these same documents come to Congress and they go back to be printed by Congress for the use of Congress. The proof must all be reread, unless Congress specifically adopts the simplified form of spelling, thereby giving direction to the Public Printer, who is under the control of Congress, giving him an authority to reprint these documents or have them printed identically in the same form of spelling they were printed in when they came from the Executive Department.

Mr. GILLET. Why would that be necessary? Why, without the explicit declaration of Congress, could not the Public Printer send it here in the simplified spelling, if we did not say we would not permit it?

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, I suppose that the Public Printer construes the order of the Executive to relate only to publications that are printed under authority of law and by direction of the Executive Department. I do not think the Public Printer would consider the order of the Executive to apply to publications that are printed by authority of Congress. While it was not stated in the hearings, he said to me that he would expect before printing the documents that are printed by authority of Congress in the simplified form of spelling, he would expect Congress to give some direction otherwise, or in the absence of any direction he would feel bound to go on and print the documents printed by authority of Congress in the manner that has heretofore obtained.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Did the Public Printer have any instructions in reference to printing the Record?

Mr. TAWNEY. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand the chairman of the Committee

on Printing of the House has made some announcement, at least there was an announcement in the press, whether he did to the Printer or not, that the RECORD would be printed in the usual form of spelling. I do not think he had any direction one way or the other.

Mr. MANN. And which, of course, I suppose, would carry with it the printing of those documents referred by the Speaker to be printed.

Mr. TAWNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MANN. So that unless there is some legislative action one way or the other we will be put in the position of having the same documents printed by the same printing office for the Government one lot spelled in one way and another lot spelled in another way.

Mr. TAWNEY. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. And if there should be a third edition issued of those documents I suppose they would have to toss a copper to see how the third edition should be spelled.

Mr. TAWNEY. It would require some legislative action. The purpose of this provision to secure uniformity in spelling in all public documents that are issued by the Executive Departments and subsequently referred to Congress, or referred to Congress as Executive documents and then having them printed under authority of Congress. The purpose is to have uniformity in spelling and save the expense of duplication work and expense.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Do you not think if you let this subject alone it will result in uniformity?

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not.

Mr. SOUTHARD. So far as Government printing is concerned.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to make an inquiry. Perhaps I am a little obtuse or have some wrong impressions. I understand there is no standard fixed by law now; that it is a question of custom at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. MANN. There is a standard fixed by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not fixed by the Government Printing Office?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand it is just a custom and usage; that there is no law.

Mr. MANN. They have rules at the Government Printing Office which themselves in many cases violate the dictionaries. I will say to the gentleman that they do not follow the dictionaries in all cases by any means.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Those rules simply refer to a standard or an accepted usage; that is all. Now, the Public Printer can conform, in the absence of any legislation, to this new standard. It is not necessary that Congress should—let me ask, does the chairman of the Committee on Printing have authority to fix the standard of printing for Congressional documents? I assume not. I think that requires an act of Congress. The whole question, I understand, is open now; that the public printing except in so far as it has been directed by the President of the United States in respect to certain classes of publications—all the balance is a matter discretionary with him, a matter of taste, a matter of usage.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now let me read what he says about that.

Mr. LITTAUER. What recognition of the progress in spelling has the Public Printer taken?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have been largely guided, in fact almost entirely governed, by the action of the publishers of Webster's Dictionary.

I merely give you that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I insist that the situation—

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLET. I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The situation is simply this: It is simply a matter of practice or a matter of custom that there is no lawful standard of spelling for public documents.

Mr. TAWNEY. Except in so far as the Executive order proposes to make a lawful standard.

Mr. MANN. That is purely a matter of taste. The Public Printer is not required to follow the law. It is utterly beyond the law.

Mr. TAWNEY. And if we do not enact any legislation the Public Printer may make documents conform to the Executive standard; he may use the Executive standard for printing some classes of documents and some other standard in relation to others.

Mr. GILLET. I had not thought of this, but I must confess at first blush I would go a step further than the gentleman. I would say that if I made a speech here and sent it down to the

Public Printer and told him I wanted it spelled in a particular way that I have a right to have it spelled in the way I say.

Mr. MANN. He would not do it. He would not spell it that way, either.

Mr. CLAYTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLAYTON]?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. We understand from the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that there is no law compelling the Public Printer to spell in any particular way, no positive law, no legislative enactment; but does not the Executive order of the President, whose appointee he is, bind him to the extent that the President may remove him if he does not conform to his directions? Would not he do it, knowing the President as you know him, and that when he says a thing he generally has some meaning to it? Do you not think he would discharge the Public Printer if he did not conform to his directions?

Mr. GILLETT. I think his recommendation to the Public Printer is very apt to receive the Public Printer's careful consideration.

Mr. CLAYTON. The Public Printer is a wise man and onto his job.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true, and it seems to me that it is, that the duty of the printer, either public or otherwise—if we are going to be at all technical about it—is to spell as the manuscript before him is spelled. He ought, it seems to me, as the gentleman has suggested, if he is requested to print his speech for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the reform method of spelling, to spell it that way. For the same reason the President ought to be allowed to control such things as emanate from the Executive Department, and they ought to be settled in accordance with the manuscript that he sends to the Printing Office to have printed.

Mr. SOUTHARD. In every case?

Mr. NORRIS. I should think so. It is the duty of the printer, and I can see that it is, to simply print what is given to him in the shape of manuscript. He ought to follow it, and if it comes from the Executive Department it would be his duty to follow it, and he ought to be removed if he does not follow it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] to yield. I want some time in my own right.

Mr. GILLETT. All right. I have finished, Mr. Chairman. I am very glad that the gentleman from Missouri can take the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this matter is not so much of a joke as it might seem at first blush. I most heartily indorse what the Committee on Appropriations did in this matter when they say:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

In the beginning I wish to modify one remark that I made to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] a little while ago. I asked him if it were not true that there is not more than one citizen of the United States out of 40,000 interested in the origin or etymology of words. Of course I know that was a very extravagant question myself. What I meant was this, that the number of persons who are interested in etymology or the derivation of words is very small in comparison with the entire population of the United States. I have spent some time, and I have no doubt that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has spent some time, ransacking the dictionaries to find out the derivation of words. Before I got to be as busy as I am now I spent a good deal of time at it. It is fascinating work. I started out to be a precisian in the use of words. Law and politics lured me from that ambitious project. It vanished along with many other dreams of my youth. But that is neither here or there. Before the President issued his remark-

able ukase there was no trouble in this country about spelling. Everybody either tried to conform his spelling to the generally accepted authorities or he paid no attention to the authorities at all and spelled to suit himself.

I will not go as far as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] went in saying that this order of the President makes "confusion worse confounded." I think that is an extravagant statement, too. But I do think that it makes a muddle where there was no sense in having any muddle. Some time before very long the people of the United States are going to insist on having a President who will attend strictly to his own constitutional functions and expend his energies only on subjects of great pith and moment. As to the Public Printer, his duty, without any statute on the subject, is to conform the spelling of these public documents that he has charge of to the usually accepted authorities in the matter of spelling, and that is what he would have done if he had been left alone. That he feels under obligations to conform his action to this order of the President I have no doubt. Failure to do so would, in all probability, mean that he would soon be ex-Public Printer. The truth is that the Public Printer has at times exercised prerogatives which nobody ever intended that he should exercise. I had a very interesting experience with the first speech I ever made in this House. I am not at all certain that any public speaker in this country, except the preacher or the lawyer or the doctor delivering a lecture, has any right to incorporate into his speech any sentence or phrase from a foreign language, because our language is the richest and most flexible ever spoken by the children of men. It grows richer and more flexible every day.

If anybody does not believe that it is the most flexible, all that he has to do is to read Don Juan to discover the most complete illustration of the flexibility of the English language. I would not recommend Don Juan to a boarding school, but in that great poem Lord Byron gave a marvelous demonstration of the flexibility of our vernacular. Our language is a hash language. Perhaps it would be in better taste to say a composite language or a verbal mosaic. It is built on a basis of German, which we often call Anglo-Saxon, a palpable misnomer, and there have been grafted on it words from every language of the world, ancient or modern. Whenever we need a new word we simply reach out into somebody else's vocabulary and appropriate it. But to return to my mutton: In the first speech I ever made here of course I made every effort to put my best foot forward. I wrote it and rewrote it and boiled it down and polished it and committed it to memory [laughter]; and I am not at all certain that it would not be better if we all did that all the time now. We would make fewer speeches, but better ones, no doubt. I wanted to be sure that I was putting the best foot forward, so I quoted a Latin sentence: "*Facilis descensus averni*."—"Easy the road to the deuce." I sent it down to the Printing Office, and they sent it back changed to "*Facilis descensus averno*," which is only the change of one letter. But I did not propose that the Public Printer should doctor up my speech, and I wanted to be certain that it was correct the way I had it. Looking over here within 40 or 50 feet I saw the most universal scholar who has been in the House in my time—Dr. William Everett, of Massachusetts—so I went to him. I presented the question to him, and he said: "Well, it does not make much difference. They both mean substantially the same thing; they are both grammatically correct; but I believe that the weight of authority is on your side."

So I sent it off to the Public Printer. In about twenty minutes Doctor Everett wrote me a note stating: "I have been investigating the matter and there are four accepted readings for that line. *Facilis descensus averni*; *facilis descensus averno*; *facilis descensus averni est*, and *facilis descensus averno est*; and the Public Printer is right." He told me afterwards that he had twenty-six editions of Virgil—twenty-three more than I knew before had been printed. Thus I settled my matter with the Public Printer.

In the shape in which this question now arises it is a practical problem. A gentleman asked me if I am in favor of phonetic spelling. I am not certain whether we could adopt it, but if we could there is no question that if we had the phonetic system of spelling which has forty-four letters in it we would absolutely save two years of the time that a child is learning to spell. They are natural-born spellers. Take any child—and every school-teacher on the floor of the House knows it—and give him the word "owl" to spell, he would spell it "ow-l" instead of "o-w-l," two letters instead of three, because there is the one sound represented by the two letters "o" and "w." If you take the forty-four letters you will have every sound included in the language. Then if you adopt the shorthand system of writing—

and you can learn that as well as you can the system we now write—you will save from three to five years in the life of every citizen in this Republic in getting an education.

There is something practical about that, but there are three arguments against that. All the etymologists will be against it. The men who want to learn the derivation of words will be against it. Every printed book in the English language is an argument against it, and every human being who has learned to spell in the usual way is a living, moving argument against it. They do not want to take the trouble to learn to spell any other way. But there is no doubt that if that system were adopted two or three years in the life of every child now living and during the life of every child to be born in the future would be saved in the matter of getting an education.

As to this order of the President, it is absolutely pitiable. It produces confusion without doing any good. I undertake to say that if you take the scholars of the House, such as my learned friend from Massachusetts, and ask them to pick 300 words for the experiment in simplified spelling no two would pick the same words and no two would agree on the spelling of the 300 words. The President says "thru;" but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] objects to spelling the word "through" in the way that the President spelled it all through his message—"thru"—because in certain places the letter "u" has a different sound from what it has in the word "through." The gentleman from Massachusetts would spell it "throo," because, so he thinks, "u" never has the sound of "oo." Now, that is all a question of geography. It depends on the section of country you are in as to whether certain sounds prevail. For instance, the word "calf" is as much entitled, under Webster's Standard Dictionary, to be pronounced "c-a-w-f" as "palm" is entitled to be pronounced "p-a-w-m;" yet let a man go into an agricultural section of the country, where they raise calves, and go around through the country talking about a c-a-w-f, and he will run good risk of having a writ de lunatico inquiring sworn out for him.

The changing of the spelling of these 300 words does not do any good. It simply muddles things.

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman think that this simplification of spelling, which, of course, he knows is going on slowly all the time, is a desirable thing?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly I do.

Mr. GILLET. Then here are 300 words, most of them being changed very slightly. Why is not the adoption of this list an acceleration of the progress in that direction? Why does the gentleman say it is so confusing?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It gets up two systems of spelling right away.

Mr. GILLET. Every change gets up two systems of spelling.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but it is very gradual.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the very point you are talking about, take the word "thru." That might spell "through" in German, it might spell "through" in half a dozen languages, but the English "u" is never pronounced "oo," and you can not make "throo" out of it. In New England there is a disposition to make "oo" sound out of "u," the old English "u." In other parts of the world "u" is pronounced "eu," and if the President was going to spell phonetically he might have done better by using "throo." This is just an illustration of the wonderful diversities of opinion which will spring up at once as to how you are going to make the spelling correspond with the sound.

Mr. GILLET. I do not think you can suggest a single other word in the list of 300 as to which the same thing is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is just the old question of "shibboleth" and "sibboleth" over again. One of the most distinguished Members of the House (I will not name him, because it might seem invidious) invariably pronounces the word "does" as though it were spelled "doos." He is not going to agree to this simplified scheme of spelling. But what I was trying to get at is the practical part of it, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. I say that the spelling of the English language is a growth, and every man who has ever read Chaucer, and from him on up, knows that very thing.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If all of these changes mean growth, then where growth has taken place why should not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as the other literature of the country, accept it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, these 300 words have not developed as a growth yet.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Oh, I think they have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They have not. Here is where the

trouble comes in about it. All over this country, without any law about it except the law of custom, where we get the common law, we have been accepting Webster's Dictionary as the established authority, or Worcester's or some of the rest of them. Now, there must be somewhere in the neighborhood of from fifty to seventy-five thousand school-teachers in the United States, and maybe more. They apply for school certificates under the statutes of their States. In Missouri we have three or four different kinds of certificates. If they stand such and such an examination, they get a certificate for life. If they stand another test, they get a certificate for five years, but the most of them get yearly certificates. Spelling is one of the things on which they are examined. I always did doubt whether there was any sense in examining anybody on spelling, because it is largely a matter of memory, except in the case of scholars who go into the derivation of words. Suppose some of these faddists got hold of these examinations, and a teacher should come up for examination; these 300 words are in the list; and the teacher spells every one of them according to the authorized standard dictionary. That teacher gets zero on spelling when graded by a faddist.

Another thing about it. We appoint boys to West Point and to Annapolis. They are examined on spelling. They are graded on spelling. Now, inasmuch as this question has been raised, suppose they set up this improved standard of spelling, but suppose they do not tell the boys what standard they are going to be judged by. Then they take enough words out of this preferred list of correctly spelled words under the new system, 300, to make up that examination, and the boys spell them according to the old standard. Every one of them gets zero on spelling.

No sensible man will sanction such rank injustice as that.

Then turn it round the other way. Suppose the applicants for school certificates and the appointees to West Point and Annapolis all believe in the simplified spelling, and these 300 words are given them to spell and they spell them according to the new style and the examiners all believe in the old style, the result is again zero in spelling for them all.

No sensible man will sanction such rank injustice as that.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not have exactly that difficulty now with such words as "honor" and "candor," which are among the list of 300. They are spelled sometimes o-u-r and sometimes o-r. According to the theory of the gentleman, he would have the same difficulty to-day when a boy passed an examination. There are two standards, and you can not say that this one is right or that one is right; both are right. The 300 words are words of that kind which already have two classes of spelling, and that confusion exists now. This simplifies and recognizes one spelling instead of the other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Common usage in this country has left the "u" out of the second syllable in all such words as "honor," "candor," etc.

Mr. GILLET. They are spelled both ways by the standard dictionaries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know they are, but they are not spelled both ways by the bulk of the people, and the majority have as much right to determine the system of spelling as the system of government.

Mr. GILLET. The boy would be right in spelling it either way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know he would.

Mr. GILLET. And so he would with any of the 300 words.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The main thing to be said about this is that it produces confusion without doing any good. I say that inasmuch as the question was raised, the Committee on Appropriations did well to bring in this proviso and let us express our opinion about it. I am willing to go the whole hog on reformed or simplified spelling, but I am not willing to take 300 words out of 120,000 and pester ourselves and everybody else with this new-fangled orthography. At that rate we would require 400 years to make a new dictionary, and then some, for while we are correcting the 120,000 words we now have we would accumulate a few thousand new words which would need correcting.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] asked me to control the time in his absence. I now yield as much time as he wants to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON].

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to speak upon the subject of appropriations at this time, nor shall I speak but a short while upon any other subject; but, sir, there is one question that, in my judgment, concerns the farming interests of this country more than any other, and to that cause do I propose to address myself at this hour.

A good many years ago I happened to be a member of the

legislature of the State of Arkansas, and while serving in that capacity I prepared and introduced a bill in that body to prevent the dealing in futures in agricultural products. The legislature saw fit to enact the measure into law, and the result was that bucket shops and agricultural gamblers and speculators were driven out of business in that State for the time being; but the interested parties were not willing to abide by the action of the legislature, and hence made a test case of the question in the courts of the State upon the ground that the law was unconstitutional in that it conflicted with that clause of the constitution which prohibited a legislative enactment in restraint of trade. The supreme court of the State, however, held that the law was not in conflict with the constitution, that it did not restrain legitimate trade in any sense of the word, and consequently every little bucket shop was driven from the State; but later the question was before the Supreme Court of the United States, and there it was held that a legislature of a State could not enact a law that would prevent a citizen of one State from having a future transaction with a citizen of another State upon the ground that it would be interfering with interstate transactions. In order, therefore, that the State law might become effective, it became necessary under the holding of the Supreme Court that Congress should pass a law preventing or prohibiting interstate transactions of that character. As soon as the Supreme Court holding was made known to me I resolved that if I was ever in a position to do so I would do everything in my power to have the Congress of the United States pass a law prohibiting interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures in so far as it affected agricultural products. So when I had the good fortune to become a member of this body I took the matter up, and I discovered that Senator BERRY, a distinguished Senator from my own State, had introduced a bill of similar character in the Senate and that it was then pending before that body. Considering his long service in the Senate entitled him to recognition upon the question as against myself, I did not introduce a bill upon the subject during the early days of my service here.

But it has been decreed that he must retire from legislative life on the 4th day of March next. Knowing that fact, I did not consider that the proprieties required that I longer wait upon his action in the matter, and hence I have prepared and introduced in this body, for the earnest consideration of its membership, the bill that I now send to the Clerk's desk to be read in my time and to be made a part of my remarks upon the subject under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20554) to prohibit interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures.

Be it enacted, etc., That interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product whatsoever, is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 2. That whoever shall so engage in buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in the United States of America, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not less than \$1,000 or imprisoned not less than one year, or both.

SEC. 3. That no letter, postal card, circular, newspaper, pamphlet, or writing or publication of any other kind containing money or any other representative of value or information of any character to be used in any manner connected with, concerning, or in furtherance of any project or transaction pertaining to the buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product, shall be carried in the mail or delivered at or through any post-office or branch thereof or by any letter carrier or other postal agent or authority. Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited, or who shall knowingly send or cause to be sent, anything to be conveyed or delivered in violation of this section, or who shall knowingly deliver or cause to be delivered by mail anything

SEC. 4. That all laws in conflict with this act be, and they are hereby, than \$500 or by imprisonment for not less than six months, or both. demeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less herein forbidden to be carried by mail, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, it is known of all men that the farmers of the world sustain it and that they have done so since its foundation. Therefore, if any class of people on earth are entitled to recognition by way of legislative enactment, they are entitled to it. Civilization, prosperity, comfort, and happiness owe more to the farmers than to any other class of people on earth, for, as stated, they have sustained the earth from its creation. Without the fruits of the farmers' toil, lawyers, doctors, bankers, merchants, mechanics—nay, sir, every other class of citizens upon the face of the earth—must within about nine days after the farmers' products give out be sent to their grave by the pangs of starvation, or else become cannibals, feasting upon their fellows, or wild men living upon the herbs and berries of the forests. In addition to producing every morsel of food upon which man subsists the farmer produces every rag of apparel that shields his form from the freezing blasts of a winter's storm or the scorching rays of a summer's sun. Then, sir,

if the farmers be the one class that feed and clothe the peoples of every character, I can see that it is the highest duty of the people's representatives to consider their cause first when they come to the enactment of law bearing upon any subject. But, sir, strange as it may seem, instead of considering the farmers' cause first, it is nearly always put aside to the last, and when the time does come to consider them the Congress is so busy in winding up its business that it can not find time to give any thought whatever to the farmer or his cause. The farmers of the country, recognizing the havoc that has been annually wrought to their cause by the dealing in futures in their products, have petitioned legislatures and Congresses from time to time to enact some law that would relieve them from the great evil that necessarily came of such gambling transactions. Last year the farmers of this country produced about 550,000,000 dollars worth of cotton, more than a billion dollars worth of corn, and nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of wheat, and yet there were several hundred times as many bales of cotton, bushels of corn and wheat sold by the stock gamblers of the country as were raised. Sold in competition with the honest product, of the honest toil, of the honest farmer, and by reason of that nefarious practice prices were run up and down at the will of the speculator, so as to cause havoc with the honest price of the product from one day to another throughout the year. I have seen cotton fluctuate in price as much as \$10 a bale within as many hours. There was no apparent reason for such a change in price other than the will of the gambling speculator. Such a practice is destructive of all honest value of the product and results in the enrichment of the speculator and the impoverishing of the men who produce it.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the great injury done the farmer by the bucket shops of the country, good citizens of every community have been wooed by them to a financial doom. These good citizens are told that some one invested a hundred dollars yesterday and made as much or more upon the investment, and hence they are encouraged to place their hard-earned coin upon the turn of the wheel of the speculator and are drawn into a whirlpool of ruin before they can extricate themselves from the great danger that always attends such investments. When they lose, as they nearly always do, they are then told by these captains of the bucket-shop industry that if they will try their fortune again they are sure they will come out all right and win back what they lost on the other transaction. Thus they are led on, step by step, until they become out-and-out gamblers themselves. To show to what extremes these speculators will go in order to lure the good citizenship of the country into their net, I will send a letter to the Clerk's desk to be read that I received from Mr. W. H. Avery, of Eldorado, Kans., and a letter that he inclosed me in the one just mentioned, written by J. K. Comstock & Co., of Chicago, to Mr. W. S. Avery, of Eldorado.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELDORADO, KANS., December 6, 1906.

Hon. Mr. MACON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice that you have introduced a bill to do away with "bucket shops." I inclose a letter from one of these concerns. Such letters are received about twice each month, and are usually sent to young men working on salary, and this man has in some instances gotten all their wages. I hope your bill will become a law at this session of Congress.

Very respectfully,

W. H. AVERY.

CHICAGO, December 3, 1906.

Mr. W. S. AVERY, Eldorado, Kans.

DEAR SIR: There is certainly going to be something "doing" in this wheat market, and it may be this coming week, and if you will only take a risk of \$6.25 or \$12.50 you will stand an excellent chance of getting 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of wheat for this small amount of money. On Friday, December 7, you can buy ups on May wheat 1½ cents away from the closing price of market on that day for eight days and 2½ cents away for fifteen days, and if the advance comes as we expect it will be for 4 or 5 cents, and you can figure your profit as well as we can. Each 1 cent advance above your up price means \$50 profit for each \$6.25 invested.

Wheat is cheap, and here is your opportunity. If market closes lower than 79 cents on Friday, so much the better for you and your purchase. If above 79 cents, it shows advance has started sooner than we expected. Everything is in your favor.

Don't delay. Send order by return mail so we can book it. If far away "wire it" at our expense and let funds follow by first mail. Orders mailed Friday, December 7, accepted. Six dollars and twenty-five cents buys five ups on 5,000 bushels for seven or fifteen days; \$12.50 buys five ups on 5,000 bushels for seven and fifteen days.

Very truly, yours,

J. K. COMSTOCK & CO.

Mr. MACON. You will observe from the reading of Mr. Avery's letter that these gamblers are anxious to catch the young men of the country, and, from the reading of the Comstock letter, that they want to catch them quick. They are not willing for them to wait to send in their orders by letter for fear they will have time to think and decide not to engage in the nefarious practice; consequently they are called upon to

"Wire it at our expense." Since introducing this bill I have received letters from each of the great subdivisions of the United States urging me to do all I could to have it passed at this session, but I will not take up the time of the House by having more of them read. I had the Avery and Comstock letters read for the purpose of showing that the people of the country are being filched of their hard earnings in every quarter of it by these speculators and the wily practices resorted to by the speculators to catch the innocent "nibbler." The Comstock letter represents that the concern deals in grain and provisions, and you would naturally suppose from the large letters on the letter head that they were legitimate dealers, but when you glance at the right-hand corner of the page you will find printed "Ups and downs a specialty," which would give the whole matter away to an experienced business man, but, as Mr. Avery says, these communications are nearly always sent to young men who are working on a salary, and they, being without experience, do not comprehend at a glance that they are dealing with speculating sharks, and hence are caught before they know it. Yes, sir, as Mr. Avery says, this concern sends out this character of letter to the young men of the country about twice a month, encouraging them to take stock in their hazardous business, and urging them to be quick about it, to write at once, and if far away to wire at their expense. Mr. Chairman, in order to catch an idea of the infamy of the business engaged in by Comstock & Co., it is only necessary to read the first part of their letter to Mr. Avery, which is as follows:

DEAR SIR: There is certainly going to be something "doing" in this wheat market, and it may be this coming week, and if you will only take a risk of \$6.25 or \$12.50 you stand an excellent chance of getting 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of wheat for this small amount of money.

Why, sir, any man of any sense at all ought to be able to see robbery stamped all over the face of that declaration. It means, simply, assuming wheat to be worth a dollar a bushel, that if one were to put up \$6.25 and get 5,000 bushels of wheat in return therefor that some one must necessarily be robbed of \$4,993.75 in order for him to get it.

Mr. Chairman, I can not conceive of a more reprehensible business than that of controlling the price of the products of the toiling masses of the country by speculative practices and at the same time debauching the young men of the country, teaching them the gambling habit, whereby they may rush in with their savings of a week or month, perhaps a year, and have them vanish on a simple turn of the speculative wheel instead of "a turn of the card."

Gentlemen, if the farmers who have been clamoring for this kind of legislation for years will only take the matter up in a plain, practical, business way with their Representatives in Congress, they will have this bill passed; but unless they unite upon the subject and organize and direct, nay, command, their Representatives here to vote for a measure of this character they will never get any relief from these "skin-game" speculators. They go on from bad to worse, enticing men of splendid character into this gambling practice, and in a sense debauching the morals of many of the best citizens of the community. How often is it in reading the press that you see where the cashier, or the assistant cashier, or the teller of this or that bank has become a defaulter in the sum of from \$10,000, perhaps, to \$500,000, all by reason of speculating in futures? Gentlemen, it is demoralizing to business in every way, and there is no one who can advocate it, from a moral or a business standpoint, except the speculator, who filches money from the pockets of the people who play at their game of hazard and ruin the farmer by controlling the price of the product of his toil. I want the farmers of this country to organize themselves and see to it that this or a measure similar to it is passed. I have no personal pride in passing this particular bill, and I am willing for it to pass under the name of any other member of this body. I simply want it passed, and I do not care whose name it bears. I want some measure passed that will give relief along the lines indicated by the measure. Sirs, a law prohibiting interstate transactions of this kind, supplemented by a legislative act preventing a citizen of a State from having similar transactions with citizens of the same State, would put an end to the whole business, and certainly the passage of this bill will stop these "luring" letters that are sent out by these gambling institutions twice a month, according to Mr. Avery, from going through the mails and enticing and inducing the young men of the country to "wire" their \$6.25 in, if they have not time to write, so that the transaction can be made without delay or without fail.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman think there might

be some very proper and profitable legislation along the line of excluding from the mails letters of the character which the gentleman has had read?

Mr. MACON. This bill provides for that.

Mr. GARRETT. The bill provides that? I am not familiar with the bill.

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir; the bill provides that all matter, written or printed, which in any wise pertains to dealing in futures shall be excluded from the mail. There is nothing, in my judgment, that concerns the farmer so much just now as this very question. I believe it is of more importance to him than any other bill that is pending before Congress at this hour. I say that with a full knowledge of the fact that there are many important measures pending here that would be helpful to the farmers if enacted into law; but, sir, I believe this is above all with them, because it deals with a practice that controls the price of their products absolutely. They have nothing to say about it at all. It makes the price fictitious all the time. They do not know, gentlemen, where they are at at any stage of the proceeding. Sirs, as I have indicated, a bale of cotton, well rounded, weighing 500 pounds, worth \$50 to-day, ought to be worth \$50 to-morrow, and would be worth \$50 to-morrow but for this speculation in price, which, gentlemen, will run it down perhaps to where it is only worth \$40 to-morrow. When the little fellows take hold of the bait and begin to nibble, the prices begin to fluctuate at once, and it is only a question of a short time when they will be safely landed in the speculator's basket, where they can flounder to the crack of doom without hope of relief. That kind of dealing makes a fictitious price, gentlemen, and is unjust in every conceivable sense, and should not be tolerated by the representatives of the American people when they know that the foundation of every institution rests upon the farmer as its corner stone. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the reason this kind of legislation is ignored by Congress is because the farmer goes along in his everyday way, following the mule from daylight until dark, too busily engaged making an honest living to agitate questions, too busy to think whether he will wire his Representative about this or that species of legislation, too tired at night to write him a letter requesting him to interest himself in this or that kind of legislation, and hence he is neglected by his Congressman. But the stockbrokers in the city of New York, in Chicago, and in all of the other speculative centers are never tired; they are never too busy to look out for their interests. They, sir, have their eyes open for such legislation as this all the time, and they can and will use the wire or the mail or any other instrumentality that can be brought to bear in order to prevent legislation of this sort. But if the farmers will organize themselves as they should, they can have their day of legislation; if they resolve that, "by the Eternal," a measure of this kind shall be passed, that they shall have relief, sir, they can get it. All they will have to do will be to say to a candidate for Congress, "I will not vote for you for the nomination unless you pledge yourself to vote for a bill to prohibit dealing in futures." If he refuses to pledge himself, then they can nominate a candidate who will pledge himself to do it, and they can find some one in every community who will. Sirs, standing here as a Democrat, loving the principles of Democracy as I do, I want to say to you that if the farmers will consult their own interests they will not again vote for anyone for nomination or election to Congress who will not pledge himself to vote to kill the "future business." If that is party treason, make the most of it. The farmers must open their eyes to the facts as they are; they have got to wake up, and if they will do it they will accomplish something along legislative lines.

But, as I have said, they have been too busy, they have not had the time; but the time is coming when they will have it; and when they do wake up, when they do start, they will make just as good hands in the matter of controlling legislation as they made soldiers in the mighty conflict between the States of this Union; and no braver or better soldiers than they ever put foot upon a battlefield or rode a charger to his death. Therefore, gentlemen, I warn you now to give the matter some thought. Investigate, see for yourselves if you do not think that the farmers are being imposed upon by the speculators of this country; see if you think it is right that they shall make the farmers' cotton worth \$40 one day and \$50 the next, and vice versa; see whether you think the farmer or the speculator ought to control the price of the farmers' cotton, their corn, their meat, and wheat. The speculators are doing it now, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. Will you, the people's representatives, allow them to continue to do so is the question that I submit to each and every one of you?

Mr. GARRETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]?
Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state approximately the effect that these "future" prices have on "spots?" I believe that the real thing is called "spots."

Mr. MACON. The "real thing" is called "spots."

Mr. GARRETT. Now, has the gentleman kept a sufficiently careful tab on prices during any given season to be able to state approximately how much the price of "futures" affects the price of "spots?"

Mr. MACON. I do not know, sir; nor do I know that anyone else does. I have a letter in my office which indicates that there is a difference of about a cent and a half between the "futures" and the "spots."

Mr. GARRETT. And does the price of the "spots" follow in fluctuation pretty much the price of the "futures?"

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir; it does absolutely. Each morning these bucket shops get telegraphic communications from their brokers, saying that middling cotton is worth so much that morning. They will immediately send runners all over the town to persons that they think would like to buy or sell at the opening figure, and it is not long before the "suckers" show up. The merchants have fallen into line with them in a large measure, and when the news comes to the broker he communicates with them by a phone, or otherwise, and they immediately adopt the speculator's price for their price. And so it has gone on and on until it has gotten to where the speculator controls the price of cotton, wheat, corn, and meat every hour of every day of every year from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. GARRETT. Can the gentleman state whether it is the practice of cotton dealers, I mean reputable cotton dealers, in the real article at the time of purchasing cotton to also purchase some cotton "futures" for the purpose of protecting themselves on the market? Is that the practice?

Mr. MACON. I believe when they buy "spots" they are forced to sell "futures" against the purchase on account of the spectacular fluctuation of the market furnished them by the speculators.

Mr. GARRETT. Is it not true that the effect of future dealing is to force legitimate cotton dealers into that practice?

Mr. MACON. There is no doubt about that. If you could do away with this "rapid-fire" speculation that could be avoided, but so long as prices change \$5 per bale in a few hours or in a day it will continue. We must do something to break up this practice that is plunging so many into crime and bankruptcy. These men are driven into the practice. It is hateful to them, and they would shout for joy to know that they were rid of it forever.

Mr. GARRETT. Now another question. Does the gentleman know a single instance in his observation where any individual in his section of the country has kept up this dealing in cotton futures for as much as three years, that that individual has not "gone broke," as they say, using a common expression?

Mr. MACON. I do not know of any.

Mr. GARRETT. They all eventually go to the wall.

Mr. MACON. In the very nature of things they will go to the wall if they keep it up.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. You have alluded to bucket shops. Does your bill also cover cotton exchanges?

Mr. MACON. The bill covers everything that pertains to "dealing in futures." It seeks to prevent anybody from dealing in "futures" through an exchange, "bucket shop," or any other instrumentality of whatever name or character.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought that was your purpose, and therefore I asked the question.

Mr. GARRETT. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be well to grant inquisitorial powers to the grand jury?

Mr. MACON. I think it would be well to require the district judge to make specific mention of the provision of the statute to the grand jury at every sitting of the court.

I have heard it said by gentlemen that it is necessary to have future transactions in order to establish markets, but that is not true. We have a tobacco market that is not established by "future" transactions. Tobacco stands on its own bottom. It is put in the hogshead and stored away in the warehouse, and buyers come and buy it according to the rule of supply and demand.

Mr. JAMES. I would state to the gentleman that tobacco is sold absolutely at the price fixed by the trust.

Mr. MACON. I suppose they can fix it; they usually do as they please, because we can not get the courts to prosecute them.

Mr. JAMES. Nobody is to be deceived by the idea that the price of tobacco is controlled by the law of supply and demand, because it is absolutely dictated by the trust; and in order to protect our part of the country from that, organizations have been made for the protection of the tobacco grower against the trust.

Mr. MACON. I am glad that is true. I think trusts ought to be organized against everywhere and prosecuted to the letter.

Mr. JAMES. The tobacco trust has monopolized the tobacco market absolutely, and denies the farmer the right to sell in an open market, but permits him only to sell in a monopolized market.

Mr. MACON. Well, of course, the trusts have things pretty much their own way, for the reason stated a moment ago. I was merely speaking of tobacco as an illustration. If its price was not controlled by the trust it would be established by the law of supply and demand, the very best market maker in the world. So would the price of cotton, meat, and grain be fixed by that God-given law but for "bucket shops."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am through with the subject for this time. I have had more to say than I thought when I took the floor, but, sir, my sincere desire to do something for the farmer, who has done so much, and who is still doing so much for mankind, has controlled me in what I have said, and is the only excuse I have to offer for having detained the House as long as I have. Judging by the small amount of legislation that has been enacted by Congress in behalf of the farmer, I am constrained to think that his cause has consumed but a bagatelle of the time of this body for the past forty years. Seemingly we have had legislation for everybody and everything but the farmer in that time, and it strikes me that it is high time for Representatives to interest themselves in his cause.

Therefore, gentlemen, I am going to ask you to give this measure careful consideration. Get a copy of the bill and read it, consult your constituents about it, and see whether or not, in your honest judgment, the condition of the agricultural toilers of this country would not be bettered if a measure of this character should become a part of the law of our land. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the expenditures of the United States Government have reached an appalling figure, and they have become so voluminous and so complicated that it is a matter of impossibility for any individual Member here to vote intelligently upon any particular item. Take, for instance, a few items in the present bill, "two clerks of class 4, four clerks of class 3, six clerks of class 2, and twenty-five clerks of class 1, etc." What Member here is in position to know whether the number of clerks in the various classes is demanded by the actual necessities of the service, or whether the compensation defined in the bill is a just compensation? What member of the Appropriations Committee is able to give a satisfactory explanation of the necessity of the number of clerks in the different classes and the compensation provided?

The Manual of the House has provided certain committees whose duty it is to make a thorough investigation of the expenditures in each Department, and the particular rule providing for these committees reads as follows:

42. The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices; the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several Departments, as follows:

43. In the Department of State: To the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

And the enumeration continues until every Department is assigned to a committee of investigation.

Thus the rules provide committees the specific duty of which is to examine thoroughly every expenditure in every Department of the Government. And yet these committees never hold meetings, and I doubt whether 90 per cent of the members of these committees can tell you to-day where their committee room is located. And the chairmen of these committees are making use of the committee rooms. Whether they are using them for their own personal purposes or for public purposes other than those provided in the rule for these committees, I am not in position to say. But we have reached that amazing condition where the chairmen of these committees have monopolized the committee rooms, and Members themselves hardly feel at liberty

to enter them. And I dare say that the same situation obtains with reference to many other committees than these committees on expenditures.

I make the assertion in good faith that it is doubtful if 90 per cent of the members of these various committees on expenditures in the different Departments could locate the committee rooms if they were asked to do so to-day. [Laughter.] This statement is applicable to every one of these committees except the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department. The chairman of that committee, Mr. LITTLEFIELD, of Maine, during the last session of Congress introduced a bill authorizing his committee to send for witnesses and papers and to institute an investigation of the expenditures in the Agricultural Department in line with the spirit of the Manual. The committee to which it was referred reported it favorably. The House adopted it, and an investigation of the Agricultural Department began. The result we have yet to learn.

The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor introduced a similar resolution; it was held up in the Committee on Rules, and no other chairman has made, so far as I know, any very great effort to revive these committees and give them the functions which they were originally designed to exercise under the intendment of the law.

I introduced myself bills reviving all of these committees except the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. These bills were referred to the Committee on Rules, and there they sleep to-day. The Committee on Rules has taken no step to give these committees the control and the authority for investigation which they should possess by favorably reporting such bills. These are some of the reasons that the expenditures of the Government are passing beyond the management and even the comprehension of the House. We are not making the investigation which we should make under the rule. We have allowed the committees whose duty it is to conduct such investigation to become absolutely inactive.

It is an illustration of the utter helplessness into which the House has fallen under the domination of the Speaker and the Committee on Rules. Once the Government was in reality a Government of three departments, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, but the inactivity of these committees is one of the greatest illustrations of the humiliating condition which we occupy to-day before the country, the Speaker regarded as the House and the Members of the House as mere automatons registering his will. It was once a government of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, but the delectable triumvirate which now dominates the Republic is composed of Theodore Roosevelt, JOSEPH G. CANNON, and the eternal devil. [Laughter and applause.]

A MEMBER. • To what department of the Government does he belong? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. To all departments, under the present political dispensation; the invisible but most influential attendant at every Cabinet meeting.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the gentleman from Texas inform me whether the Committee on Improvement of the Levees of the Mississippi River has ever been revived?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you a member of that committee?

Mr. WALLACE. I was for two years, and there was never a called meeting of it, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you know where the committee room was located?

Mr. WALLACE. I walked in front of the door once, but never darkened it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. I will tell the gentleman that we brought that committee to life at the last session of Congress, and it recommended to the House and the House passed a bill from that committee.

Mr. WALLACE. I thank the gentleman for the information, and congratulate him and all who were interested in bringing it about.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will ask the gentleman in charge of the time on the other side [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if he has anyone else who desires to speak at the present time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have no other demand from my side of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no demand from that side of the House for time, but I understand there will be to-morrow; and I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is declared carried, I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can do that in the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21574, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

REPRINT OF LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, being informed that copies of the House bill now under consideration are exhausted, together with the report, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill and report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and the report thereon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GORDON, IRONSIDES & FARES COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in regard to the application of the British embassy, in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company, of Canada, for reimbursement in the sum of \$7,626.08, which they allege the United States customs authorities improperly exacted of them in November, 1902, as duties on certain sheep and cattle.

I renew the recommendation which I made to the Congress on January 12, 1904, that, in view of the facts shown in the correspondence, provision be made for the company's reimbursement.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

The message and accompanying documents were referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution approved May 1, 1900, I transmit herewith five ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

The attention of Congress is invited to the statement of the Secretary of State that the transmission of these ordinances does not imply any request that they be printed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

The SPEAKER. The message transmitting these ordinances contains the following:

The attention of Congress is invited to the statement of the Secretary of State that the transmission of these ordinances does not imply any request that they be printed.

Now, the Chair is under the impression that the fact of the reference will, under the rule, carry with it the printing of the ordinances. Apparently they are not very bulky, and if there is no motion to the contrary, the message and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and be printed.

BRITISH SCHOONER LILLIE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in the claim of the British schooner *Lillie*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

ORDINANCES OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith nine ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

EASTERN EXTENSION AUSTRALASIA AND CHINA TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the

accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, with reference to the claim of the Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company for compensation on account of expenses incurred in repairing its Manila-Hongkong and Manila-Capiz cables which were cut by the United States forces during the war with Spain.

I renew the recommendation made by President McKinley, that as an act of equity and comity provision be made by the Congress for reimbursement to the company of the actual expenses incurred by it in the repair of the cables.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

LIEUT. COL. L. K. SCOTT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning the claim of Lieut. Col. L. K. Scott, a British subject, on account of the adoption by the Ordnance Department of the United States Army of a system of sighting of which he is the inventor.

In view of the recognition by the Chief of Ordnance of the Army of the equitable right of Lieutenant-Colonel Scott to payment for the use of his invention, I recommend that provision be made by Congress for the payment of this claim.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. BINGHAM (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, asking authority from Congress for Capt. Dorr F. Tozier, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, to accept a sword tendered him by the Lords Commissioners of the British Admiralty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary to rent buildings on sites purchased by the Government for public buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Astoria Harbor, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, submitting a detailed statement of claims of postmasters acted on during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, submitting his annual report—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the report of Edwin W. Sims on the Alaskan fur-seal fisheries—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of increased appropriation for the post-office at Red Wing, Minn.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for survey, etc., of lands in Flathead Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Truckee-Carson irrigation project as related to the Paiute allotments—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Big and Little Fork rivers, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Broadkill Creek, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, a statement of cost of manufacture of guns by the Government during the fiscal year ended

June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Susan Shatswell, executrix of estate of Nathaniel Shatswell, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William L. Ross against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ernest C. North against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John H. Arey against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Benjamin S. Ford against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph D. Wyatt against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William W. Wenner, executor of estate of Joseph Waltman, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John W. Harvey, jr., administrator of estate of Z. H. German, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of P. L. Williams, administrator de bonis non cum testamento annexo of estate of John S. Pendleton, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Minor Saunders against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles A. Rolfe, administrator of estate of Oscar A. Rolfe, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of T. M. Davidson, administrator of estate of Margaret Davidson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Clarissa H. Tipton, administratrix of estate of Isaac Tipton, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. C. Gill, administrator de bonis non of estate of Edward O. Watkins, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William H. Boswell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of A. P. Young, administrator of estate of John R. Pearson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry Millingar against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the actions filed by the court in the cases of W. Delap and Hallam Eldredge against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, trans-

mitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Margaret A. Hickman against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John B. Eads against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Delaware Indians against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Thomas Bowler and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of W. J. McGowan and Samuel G. Holland's executor against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of certain cases dismissed by the court for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Joseph C. Hodges and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Nora Walsh against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Nelson O. Underwood and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action of the court in the cases of Thomas Watkins and others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Ann Worthington and sundry others against The United States, because of findings that claimants were not loyal—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Julia Zepp, administratrix of estate of Henry Zepp, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Septimus Brown against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph H. Harrison and others, heirs of estate of Henry Harrison, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the decisions filed by the court in the cases of A. Jackson Jones and William Rutherford against The United States, dismissed for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Solomon Foulk against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting papers relating to the claim of Arthur G. Fiske, postmaster at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Long Cove, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pen-

sions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lonergan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5329); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1673) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Edson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5330); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20623) granting an increase of pension to James B. O. Horbach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5331); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20829) granting an increase of pension to David M. Watkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5332); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2761) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mahoney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5333); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20844) granting an increase of pension to Milton Russell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5334); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20899) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Carpenter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5335); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20965) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Sine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5336); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21054) granting an increase of pension to William G. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5337); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21228) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Crissip, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5338); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12557) granting an increase of pension to John C. Berry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5339); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21304) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kohl, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5340); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18089) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Harte, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5341); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18454) granting an increase of pension to Barlow Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5342); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19044) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. McCormick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5343); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19990) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Christie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5344); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19963) granting an increase of pension to Charles Alford Carter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5345); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19541) granting an increase of pension to Job F. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5346); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20350) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Reighter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5347); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20384) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5348); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14298) granting an increase of pension to John Remick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5349); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14543) granting an increase of pension to Charles Barnell, alias Richard North, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5350); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15471) granting an increase of pension to Eli Stover, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5351); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16002) granting a pension to Theodore T. Bruce, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5352); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12554) granting an increase of pension to William Larraby, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5353); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16101) granting a pension to Alice Pugh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5354); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18295) granting a pension to Joshua B. Casey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5355); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10751) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5356); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10760) granting a pension to Libbie Merrill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5357); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10916) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Shreeves, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5358); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11701) granting a pension to Marion Waldorph, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5359); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12370) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Randolph, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5360); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R.

13455) granting an increase of pension to Josiah P. Higgins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5361); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4834) granting an increase of pension to Silas V. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5362); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zachary, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5363); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8312) granting an increase of pension to Abram Sours, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5364); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8915) granting an increase of pension to Susan Woolley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5365); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8668) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Rogers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5366); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21302) granting an increase of pension to Nicolaus Kirsch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5367); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 21669) to provide for the incorporation of banks within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21670) to regulate the production and sale of milk and cream in and for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 21671) to provide for the rapid defense of the Pacific coast ports—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 21672) to increase the weight of packages of fourth-class matter that may be conveyed by mail over local rural free-delivery routes and fixing the rate of postage thereon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 21673) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States over the court of appeals of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21674) to prohibit Senators and Representatives in Congress and Senators and Representatives elect from serving or receiving pay from public service corporations and other persons as officer, agent, representative, or attorney, and providing penalties therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 21675) to regulate the salaries of letter carriers in free-delivery offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 21676) authorizing readjustment of compensation to be paid for transportation of mails on railroad routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 21677) to amend an act granting to the Davenport Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain a canal, power station, and appurtenant works in the Mississippi River in Scott County, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 21678) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, within the counties of Yellowstone and Rosebud, in the State of Montana—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21679) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Billings, Mont.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 21680) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Arkansas River between the mouth of the Poteau River and the mouth of the Grand River, near the city of Muscogee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 21681) to appropriate \$50,000, in addition to the sum now being expended, for demonstration farm work in the cotton-growing States afflicted with the Mexican cotton boll weevil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 21682) to provide for an allowance for subsistence of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21683) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 21684) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21685) for the extension of Nineteenth street NW. from Woodley road to Biltmore street, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 21686) to extend the privileges of the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the city of Fort Worth, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21687) to further promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 21688) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Cleburne, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 21689) to increase the limit of cost of five light-house tenders heretofore authorized—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 21690) for the erection of a public building at Abbeville, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21691) to increase the compensation of carriers on rural free-delivery mail routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 21692) to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to provide for furnishing certified copies of certain records—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21693) to provide for the purchase of a suitable site and the erection of a public building for the United States post-office at Hillsboro, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 21694) for the erection of a public building at Newberry, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 196) relating to the construction of a bridge at Fort Snelling, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 197) proposing an amendment to the Constitution fixing the term of the President and Vice-President at six years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 198) requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and report on car shortage of interstate carriers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 45) concerning the adjournment of Congress for the holiday recess—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: A resolution (H. Res. 651) directing the Postmaster-General to report to the House certain information concerning clerks and carriers in the Chicago post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A resolution (H. Res. 652) requesting the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to investigate the causes of the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res. 653) for the appointment of a stenographer to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 21695) granting an increase of pension to James A. Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21696) granting a pension to Oliver C. C. Pollock, alias John E. Douglass—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21697) granting an increase of pension to Clark Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21698) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21699) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21700) granting an increase of pension to Eli Hovis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21701) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 21702) granting an increase of pension to John Cyrus Rinehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 21703) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Reickert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21704) granting an increase of pension to George Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21705) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21706) granting a pension to W. M. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21707) granting an honorable discharge to Robert D. Keffer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21708) granting an honorable discharge to Haden Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21709) granting a pension to Susan Hensley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 21710) granting an increase of pension to Truman Covert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21711) granting an increase of pension to Thor Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21712) granting an increase of pension to George C. Howland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21713) granting an increase of pension to William Orr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21714) granting an increase of pension to William A. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21715) granting an increase of pension to Wesley McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21716) granting an increase of pension to John Sine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21717) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21718) granting an increase of pension to Franz Z. F. W. Jensen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 21719) granting a pension to Winnie Turner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 21720) granting a pension to Clark R. Parcel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21721) granting a pension to John R. Kissinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 21722) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21723) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21724) granting an increase of pension to John D. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21725) granting an increase of pension to John S. McNair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21726) granting an increase of pension to Victory T. Trail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21727) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Benson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 21728) granting a pension to James W. Beville—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21729) to authorize the President of the United States, with the consent of the Senate, to place James M. Alden on the retired list of the Navy with the rank and retired pay of a lieutenant—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 21730) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Raff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21731) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21732) granting an increase of pension to John Gumpert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 21733) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Matley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 21734) granting an increase

of pension to Stephen B. H. Shanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21735) granting an increase of pension to Walter W. Brunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21736) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21737) granting an increase of pension to William C. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21738) granting an increase of pension to Harrison P. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21739) granting an increase of pension to John Rittenhouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 21740) granting an increase of pension to Maria R. Klindt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 21741) for the relief of William J. Briggs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 21742) granting a pension to Mary J. Kerens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 21743) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 21744) for the relief of the estate of John Hoey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 21745) for the relief of Maj. George A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 21746) granting an increase of pension to William N. Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21747) granting an increase of pension to Bell R. Finleyson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21748) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21749) granting an increase of pension to Annie Reaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21750) granting a pension to the minor children of William Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 21751) granting an increase of pension to William D. Wolford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21752) granting an increase of pension to James Dees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21753) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21754) granting an increase of pension to William Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21755) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Godby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21756) granting an increase of pension to William T. Belk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21757) granting a pension to Newton Gambrel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21758) granting an honorable discharge to Amasa Hodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 21759) granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Perkins, alias Jacob Perkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 21760) granting a pension to Morgan Van Gorder—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 21761) granting an increase of pension to John Tims—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 21762) granting an increase of pension to Darwin A. Brink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21763) granting an increase of pension to S. J. Sargent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 21764) granting an increase of pension to Ment Stannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 21765) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21766) granting a pension to Louisa M. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 21767) granting an increase of pension to George Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 21768) granting a pension to Eliza Bracelin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21769) granting a pension to Emma Aiken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21770) granting a pension to Mary A. Alliger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21771) granting an increase of pension to George W. Amick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21772) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin F. Hurley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 21773) for the relief of R. K. Forrest, administrator of J. W. Forrest, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 21774) granting a pension to Samuel Meade Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 21775) for the relief of F. M. Wadley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21776) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Tobey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 21777) granting a pension to Mary D. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21778) granting a pension to Lucy F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 21779) granting an increase of pension to James Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 21780) granting an increase of pension to Luman Van Hoosen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21781) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 21782) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 21783) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Ricklesen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21784) granting an increase of pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21785) granting a pension to Sarah A. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 21786) granting a pension to Thomas Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21787) granting a pension to Alexander Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21788) granting a pension to Satina A. Waymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 21789) granting an increase of pension to Marion W. Brosier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 21790) for the relief of Hyter Myers—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 21791) granting a pension to Icybinda Spalding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 21792) granting a pension to Frank H. Loud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 21793) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 21794) granting an increase of pension to Centennial W. Shreckengast—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21795) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 21796) granting a pension to Richard Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 21797) granting an increase of pension to Edgar F. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21798) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 21799) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Rickrode—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21800) granting an increase of pension to Louis N. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21801) granting an increase of pension to John Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21802) granting a pension to Charles P. Kibler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21803) granting a pension to Anna R. Slothower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21804) granting a pension to Ella K. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 21805) grant-

ing an increase of pension to Ira Shafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21806) granting an increase of pension to Michael L. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21807) granting an increase of pension to James T. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 21808) granting an increase of pension to Levi Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21809) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. McStraw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21810) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Dornsife—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21811) granting an increase of pension to Melvin W. Diver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21812) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21813) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kelmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 21814) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe P. Soper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21815) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 21816) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 21817) granting a pension to Jennie E. Keown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21818) granting an increase of pension to William Hardesty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 21819) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Peach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 21820) for the relief of Martin H. Avey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21821) for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21822) granting a pension to John B. Laillet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21823) granting a pension to Myron T. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21824) granting a pension to Martha E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21825) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Nicholls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21826) granting an increase of pension to John Mehafeff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21827) granting an increase of pension to Francis Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21828) granting an increase of pension to Noah Perrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21829) to amend the military record of Joseph H. Gible—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21830) to amend the military record of Joseph S. Hurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 21831) granting an increase of pension to Anson B. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21832) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21833) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21834) granting a pension to Nancy J. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21835) granting an increase of pension to Allen L. Bevan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21836) granting a pension to Mary C. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 21837) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 21838) granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Terry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 21839) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 21840) granting an increase of pension to Charles Tribolin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 21841) for the relief of H. C. Linn and Samuel Powell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 21842) granting

an increase of pension to Danford Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21843) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Delaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21844) for the relief of Hansell Hatfield, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21845) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Hemphill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 21846) granting a pension to Mayer Frankel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21847) granting a pension to John Baringer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 21848) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Arthur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 21849) granting an increase of pension to John P. Dix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21850) granting an increase of pension to James Orlando Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21851) granting a pension to Joseph W. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 21852) granting an increase of pension to James M. Eaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21853) granting an increase of pension to William A. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21854) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21855) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 21856) granting an increase of pension to John G. Viall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 21857) to correct the military record of Jacob Rockwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21858) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 21859) granting an increase of pension to Simon Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 21860) granting an increase of pension to William F. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21861) granting an increase of pension to William Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21862) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21863) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Stowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21864) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 21865) for the relief of John B. Page, first lieutenant Company K, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 21866) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Atkinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 21867) for the relief of Charles L. Blanton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 21868) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Tiebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21869) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21870) granting an increase of pension to John A. Mayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21871) granting an increase of pension to H. B. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21872) granting a pension to Samuel J. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21873) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 21874) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Chisam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21875) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21876) granting a pension to Jane Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21877) granting a pension to Cinderella Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21878) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21879) granting an increase of pension to Even Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21880) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Noel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21881) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21882) granting an increase of pension to Frank Breazeale—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21883) granting an increase of pension to George W. Saunders—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 21884) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21885) granting a pension to Sylvania S. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 21886) granting an increase of pension to John Bryant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21887) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hayman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21888) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Canova—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21889) granting a pension to Albert V. Sieren—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21890) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21891) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Sinclair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21892) granting an increase of pension to James F. Westenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21893) granting an increase of pension to George Albright—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 21894) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21895) granting an increase of pension to John Satory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 21896) granting an increase of pension to George H. Field—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 21897) granting a pension to C. F. Schantz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21898) granting a pension to Joseph Cornelius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21899) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Koch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21900) granting an increase of pension to Hellen O. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21901) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21902) granting an increase of pension to Sybil Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21903) granting an increase of pension to Celia Congdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21904) granting an increase of pension to Margaretha Esswein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21905) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Everly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21906) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bruder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21907) granting an increase of pension to William Lange—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21908) granting an increase of pension to Edward Dullea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21909) granting an increase of pension to George W. W. Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21910) granting a pension to Emil S. Weisse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21911) granting an increase of pension to George Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21912) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21913) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pieper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21914) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Pahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21915) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21916) granting an increase of pension to John W. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21917) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hambricht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21918) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21919) granting an increase of pension to Orland F. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21920) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Jillson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21921) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21922) granting an increase of pension to Hugo Arndt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21923) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Fuchs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21924) granting an increase of pension to Donald McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21925) granting a pension to Catherine Brill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Catherine Eberlein—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21450) granting a pension to Will. P. Hall—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21528) granting a pension to Martha A. Wright—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21529) granting a pension to Charlotte Game—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21530) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Bonner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21531) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Macy—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward W. Ferry and 1,575 other veteran soldiers in the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, against removal of the canteen from the Homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of the colored citizens of Danville, Ill., under directions of the Constitutional League, relative to the discharge of colored soldiers of Companies B, C, and D of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Continental Legion, of Danville, Ill., regarding the discharged colored soldiers of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, for an appropriation of not less than \$50,000,000 annually for improvement of rivers and harbors and waterways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Division No. 78 of the Order of Railway Conductors and other labor organizations, for the Merchant Marine Commission shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, for legislation relative to the law of libel (H. R. 11027, by Mr. GOEBEL)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen C. Allbright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of 283 citizens of Portsmouth and Newcastle, N. H., and Kittery, Me., for an appropriation to dredge Peppereles Cove, in Portsmouth Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of Hansen J. Schwartz and 282 other residents of Roswell, N. Mex., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Petition of the Yonkers Federation of La-

bor, praying enactment of an eight-hour law so framed as to be applicable to work on battle ships, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Calvin E. Morley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANNON: Petition of McDermott Council, No. 266, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring an increase in the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Patriotic Council, No. 47, Daughters of Liberty; Smoky City Council, No. 119; Lescalette Council, No. 442, and Purity Council, No. 554, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alexander Hanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring the Mann patent bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of Ben Franklin Council, No. 10, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Olympia Council, of Middletown, N. Y., and Delaware Council, of Port Jervis, N. Y., Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, for Appalachian and White mountains forest reservations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Abe Lincoln Council, No. 64, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of North Sedgwick, Me., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Nannie S. Berry, heir of Henry Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolutions of Akron Council, No. 906, of Akron, Pa., and Empire Council, No. 120, of Lancaster, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of the passage of bill S. 4403, for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of A. B. Lowry, against the feature of the copyright bill detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of J. A. Turner, jr., of Tampa, Fla., against the feature of the copyright law detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of the City of Key West, Fla., for an increase of the artillery corps of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Florida, for repeal of the duty on works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, for increase of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Musical Copyright League, against the feature of the copyright bill detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for bill S. 6291, the Merchant Marine Commission bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CROMER: Petitions of Dunkirk Council, No. 14; Boundary Council, No. 59, and Delaware Council, No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of General McClellan Council, No. 150; Eureka Council, No. 38, and Star of the West Council, No. 465, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: Paper to accompany bill for

relief of the estate of John Hoey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Armory Lodge, No. 429, International Association of Machinists, of Rock Island, Ill., for the shipping bill (subsidy)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Will P. Hall (previously referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Amasa Hodge and Newton Gambrel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Dies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition for the repeal of bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOYD: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 21385, relative to improvements on the White River, in States of Missouri and Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of S. H. Britts and A. H. Alfrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ment Stannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of New Era Council, No. 229; Winton Council, No. 283, and Price Hill Council, No. 210, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. E. Yoell, for inquiry by Congress into the methods and motives of Panama Canal Commission relative to the employment of Chinese labor on the canal—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Vine Cliff Council, No. 83, Daughters of Liberty, and Decatur Council, No. 613, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Troy Hill Council, No. 319, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Fruit Growers' Association, for legislation to further the admission of American fruit to German markets under minimum duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hildale Council, No. 235, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. H. Harrison and 1,150 business men of Pittsburg, Pa., for bill H. R. 9754, relative to improvement in the classification of the clerical force in post-offices and for an increase of salaries, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring an increase of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Washington Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the librarian of Brown University and of Redwood Library, of Newport, R. I., against section 30 of the bill H. R. 19853 and of the bill S. 6330, against restriction of importation of English books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of R. K. Forrest, administrator of estate of J. W. Forrest—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Meade Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of H. L. Reynolds and 75 others, of Connecticut, for an appropriation to remove obstructions in Eightmile River, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. H. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John F. Yeargin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Thomas Kay & Son, against that feature of the copyright law detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petitions of Goddess of Liberty Council, No. 155; Pride of Mechanics' Home Council, No. 61, of Jamesburg, N. J., and Golden Rod Council, No. 20, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper of Major Jenkins Post, No. 99, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hanover, Pa., to accompany bill for relief of Henry Hamme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Peach Bottom Council, No. 715, and Cordorus Council, No. 115, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Dallaston Council, No. 105, Daughters of Liberty; Iowa Council, No. 26, Daughters of America; Aurora Council, No. 304, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Betsey Ross Council, No. 119, Daughters of Liberty, and Moss Ross Council, No. 292, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of William McKinley Council, No. 182, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of George Upington, for bill S. 6339, relative to a general revision of the copyright laws—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, against the tariff on art works—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Fisher Grange, No. 790, against the free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Rescue Council, of Camden, N. J.; Diamond Council, and Thomas Jefferson Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Pride of Bridgeport Council, Daughters of Liberty, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of citizens of Somerville, Mass., and the Woman's Education Association of Boston, against the tariff on art works (bill H. R. 15268)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of G. N. Hawley, against that feature in the copyright law inimical to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Rock Island Business Men's Association, for the improvement of the Mississippi River in the interest of transportation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Kasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of Waynesboro Council, No. 760, Junior Order United American Mechanics; James A. Garfield Council, No. 129, Daughters of Liberty, and Lewisburg Council, No. 52, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Tribolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Nipper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Robert H. Delaney, Thomas R. Elliott, James P. Shaw, Danford Redding, Hansel Hatfield, J. H. Allison, and T. R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George H. Layman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of Pride of Alleghany Council, No. 28, and Golden Rule Council, No. 31, Daughters of Liberty; Resolute Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Jennings Rens Council, No. 15, Daughters of America; Progressive Council, No. 83; Mountain City Council, No. 11; Valley Council, No. 26, and Myersville Council, No. 125, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Michael Isanogle and heirs of Upton Worthington—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. Eaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. Martin Compton, heir of John Compton, and the heirs of Harvey N. Parham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles G. Perrin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Warren A. Woodson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Shamokin, Pa., favoring the shipping bill (Senate subsidy bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of citizens of Missouri, praying for legislation for the protection of fruit growers against dishonest commission firms—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of R. T. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Saunders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Breazeale—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of the librarian of the Toledo public library, against abridgement of the existing rights of libraries to import English books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. B. May, against the feature of the copyright law inimical to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Future Great Council, No. 290, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., for the Steenerson drainage bill (H. R. 10502; January 5, 1906)—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary J. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Paperhangers, Decorators, and Painters' Local Union No. 766, of Bloomington, Ill., for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the One hundred and thirteenth Illinois Veteran Volunteer Infantry Association, favoring an increase of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Emma S. Hunter, J. E. Waldon, and Andrew Sayles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William A. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Petition of Victory Council, No. 93, Daughters of Liberty, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of Palestine Council, No. 30; Burning Springs Council, No. 17; Parkersburg (W. Va.) Council, No. 13, and Young America Council, No. 201, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD: Petitions of Pride of Trenton Council, No. 4, and Capital City Council, No. 20, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 11, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

SENATOR FROM UTAH.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to state that on Thursday next, the 13th instant, immediately after the morning business, I shall call up for consideration Report No. 4253 and the resolution "That REED SMOOT is not entitled to a seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Utah," and submit some remarks thereon.

STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

Mr. RAYNER. I wish to state that to-morrow, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall briefly address the Senate on the resolution in connection with the public schools of California and Japanese pupils.

POPULAR EDITION OF RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Public Printer, transmitting a report of an examination into the cost of labor and material required, etc., with respect to printing, at a reduced price, a special edition of the